ORCHESTRAS ONTARIO

AN EXAMINATION

OF

THE ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL'S ORCHESTRAL SUPPORT PROGRAMS:

HISTORY, RATIONALE, DELIVERY

FINAL REPORT

SUBMITTED
TO
MS. GWENLYN SETTERFIELD: MUSIC OFFICER

JUNE 14 1988

PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR: G. CAMPBELL TROWSDALE
PROJECT CONSULTANT: ROBERT E. CREECH

Therefore, Calculate a plan with Five Working Fundamentals,
And examine the condition of each.
The first is Tao.
The second is Nature.
The third is Situation.
The fourth is Leadership.
The fifth is Art.

Sun Tzu (The Art Of Strategy
trans. R.L.Wing)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

SECTION 1

1. PROCEDURES

1.1. The Problem 1
1.2. The Literature 2
1.3. Methodology 4
1.4. Definitions 7

SECTION 2

2. THE EVOLUTION OF PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR ORCHESTRAS IN ONTARIO

2.1. Public Support and the O.A.C. 9
2.2. The Schabas Report 11
2.3. The First Music Officer: Walter Ball 12
2.4. Public Support in an Expanding Economy: 1963 – 1975 12
2.5. Public Support in a Restrained Economy: 1975 – 1986 13
2.6. Growth & Restraint: 1986 – 1988 14
2.7. A Changing Role for the O.A.C. 14

SECTION 3

3. THE O.A.C. & THE ORCHESTRA COMMUNITY OF ONTARIO

3.1. Documentation for Funding Support 17
3.2. Contractual Commitments for Funding 17
3.3. Board Responsibility 18
3.4. Classification vs Local Initiative 19
3.5. Evaluation 20
3.6. A Matrix System 21
3.7. Goals, Objectives and Guidelines 23
3.8. The Audience Constituency 24
3.9. Community Orchestras Become Ontario Orchestras 25
3.10. New Orchestra Program 28
3.11. Innovation/Risk Program 30
3.12. Professional Assistance for Remote Communities 31
3.13. Resident Musician Program 33

SECTION 4

4. FUNDING FOR ORCHESTRAS 2001

4.1. CBR: Community Based Revenue 36
4.2. NCBF: New Cycle Base Funding 38
4.3. Guaranteed Minimum Funding & Achievement Grants 40
4.4. Guaranteed Funding & Responsibility 43
4.5. Accountability and Achievement Grants 44
4.6. New Cycle Base Funding & Project Funding 46
4.7. Adjusted New Cycle Base Funding 47
4.8. Project Funding to Operating Funding 48
4.9 Resource Pool 49
4.10. An Expanded O.A.C. Service Capability 51
4.11. Financial Stabilization Fund 53
4.12. Priorities 54
4.13. Accurate Grant Information 56

SECTION 5

5. INTERACTION: THE ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL, THE CANADIAN MUSIC CENTRE & THE ONTARIO FEDERATION OF SYMPHONY ORCHESTRAS

5.1. Canadian Repertoire: A C.M.C. Field Service 57
5.2. Canadian Repertoire: A "Sampler" Approach 58
5.3. Canadian Repertoire: Suitability 59
5.4. New Canadian Composition: Composer – in – Residence 61
5.5. Flexibility & Accountability: A Role For OFSO 62
5.6. The Development of Board Expertise 64
5.7. Strategic Planning Models 65
5.8. An Expanded Administrative Residency Program 67
5.9. The Recognition of Excellence 69
5.10. A Festival of Orchestras 70
5.11. Library Resources and Research 71
5.12. OFSO and the Reporting of Statistical Data 73
5.13. An Ontario Regional Director for OFSO 74
5.14. Performance Space Costs 74

SECTION 6

A SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 76

SECTION 7

BIBLIOGRAPHY 82

PREFACE

This report marks the end of seven months during which we travelled throughout the province, consulted, interviewed, listened to concerts and read widely in the fascinating area of the symphony orchestra particularly as it has evolved in the province of Ontario since 1967. It is not hyperbole to state that Ontario's orchestral development over the past two decades is nothing short of incredible. There is now a strong and vital orchestra community that provides live performance of specialized and symphonic repertoires throughout much of the province. It has been our privilege and our pleasure not only to look at the orchestra as a major cultural institution in a general context but to meet personally many of the individuals whose commitment to music has enabled this development to proceed.

There are inevitable problems, of course, given the explosive nature of the orchestral growth that has occurred in Ontario. These difficulties are addressed in the Report. What is just as important for us, however, is the feeling of commitment, vitality and enthusiasm that characterized so many of the people and so much of the music making we came into contact with.

Certainly, a study of this kind would have been impossible without the active assistance and co-operation of music directors, board chairpersons and administrators of Ontario's orchestras. They gave freely of their time and their ideas in the midst of hectic schedules. The help extended by the music officers of the O.A.C., the Canadian Music Centre and OFSO was exemplary. We are particularly grateful for the ideas and time that Ezra Schabas and Franz Kraemer were prepared to share so generously with us. The resource pool of professional expertise now available in Ontario suggests that the foundations have been well prepared for the next stage of orchestral growth.

SECTION 1

1. PROCEDURES

1.1. THE PROBLEM

1.1.1. BACKGROUND

Two years after its inception, the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts commissioned Professor Ezra Schabas to undertake a pioneering study of orchestras in Ontario. His report, "Ontario Community Orchestras," covered 13 orchestras of varying size and capacity. When presented to Council in 1966, it provided a conceptual basis for sustaining the explosion in orchestral activity which was to occur over the next two decades. Only the Toronto Symphony did not fall within his mandate.

During these years, the Ontario Arts Council's financial support increased from $60,000 in 1966 – 67 for 13 orchestras to just under $2 million in 1987 – 88 for 35 orchestras, excluding the Toronto Symphony and the National Arts Centre Orchestra. In the same period, support for the Toronto Symphony increased from $75,000 to $1,254,322 from the Council.

With this kind of growth, it was inevitable that problems would emerge, regardless of the soundness of guidelines established at an early stage of development. It was within such a context that the Council decided it was time to undertake another major study of Ontario orchestras. In November, 1987, funding for the project was approved and work began the following month.

1.1.2. THE MANDATE

The mandate for the study was sufficiently broad to cover all adult orchestras in the province with the important exceptions of the Toronto Symphony and the National Arts Centre Orchestra. Included were 35 of the 36 currently funded orchestras, orchestras which had at one time received funding but were no longer eligible for a variety of reasons, orchestras which had never received funding but had made application for assistance and orchestras which had never applied for a grant but were making an important musical contribution to their community.

The commissioning letter indicated that all aspects of orchestral activity were to be considered:

> We want to look at the efficacy of our funding, whether the guidelines presently used to review orchestras are relevant, whether the objectives themselves are complete or should be revised. We also want to know what the general trends are in the orchestral world, what the successes and failures of our funding have been, what new initiatives we might undertake...

This meant looking at boards, administrators, music directors and musicians; funding, community support, community service and artistic achievement; touring, residential musicians, contracts and professional core players; educational programming, audience development, the performance of Canadian repertoire and the commissioning of new work; the role of the O.A.C. in relation to the Canadian Music Centre and the Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras. Current procedures used in determining the eligibility of orchestras for grant assistance were to be examined, and recommendations prepared, that would address the multitude of problems that had accumulated over a twenty-year period of intensive growth.

1.2. THE LITERATURE

1.2.1. GENERAL

During the past twenty years, a substantial literature has developed that deals specifically with the symphony orchestra. At least five journals are devoted exclusively to symphony concerns: **Orchestra Canada** [Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras (O.F.S.O.) and Association of Canadian Orchestras (A.C.O.)], **O.C.S.M. Newsletter** [Organization of Canadian Symphony Musicians], **Symphony Magazine** [American Symphony Orchestra League], **Symphony News** [U.S.A.] and **Das Orchester** [German].

A score of more generally focussed periodicals such as **Musicanada**, **Music Magazine** [Canada], **Performing Arts Magazine** [Canada] and **Classical Music** [England] include regular articles and reports on issues of concern to symphony orchestras. Important research studies such as that commissioned by the Vienna Philharmonic [Pipirek, Max. (1981). **Stress and Music: Medical, Psychological, Sociological, and Legal Strain Factors in a Symphony Orchestra Musician's Profession**, Vienna: Wilhelm Braumuller, p.78] are beginning to appear.

The bibliography prepared for this report, a relatively limited selection of materials, gives some indication of the resources available.

1.2.2. SPECIFIC

Since the appearance of the Schabas Report [1966], various governmental agencies and cultural institutions have initiated reports which have relevance to orchestral development in this province.

1966 [O.A.C., O.F.S.O.] "Report to the Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras." (Ball)

1968 [Canada Council, O.A.C.] "Toronto's Orchestral Resources." (Appelbaum)

1975 [Kingston Symphony] "The St. Lawrence Symphony Orchestra: A Model for a Feasibility Study." (Cole)

1976 [C.B.C., C.O.C., N.B.C., O.A.C., T.S.O.] "Toronto's New Orchestra." (Schabas)

1979 [Canada Council] "The State of Canadian Orchestras." (Kraemer)

1980 [O.F.S.O.] "Recommendations for the Future: A Report of the OFSO Task Force." (OFSO Task Force)

1982 [Saskatoon Symphony] "The Saskatoon Symphony Society In Relation To Its Education Program." (Burgess)

1983 [O.A.C.] For Arts' Sake: A History of the Ontario Arts Council 1963 – 1983. (MacSkimming)

1983 [C.C.] "A Report on Orchestral Music in New Brunswick and its Development." (Schabas & Streatfield)

1983 [O.A.C] "Survey of Performing Arts Organizations." (Ericass Management)

1983 [O.F.S.O.] "Brief to the Special Committee for the Arts." (OFSO Government Communications Committee)

1984 [A.C.O., C.B.A.C.] "The Community Impact of Canadian Orchestras." (Wall & Mitchell)

1984 [Ministry of Citizenship & Culture] Special Committee for the Arts: Report. (Macaulay)

1985 [O.F.S.O.] "The Future of the Symphony Orchestra: Conference Report." (Webster)

1985 [Kitchener – Waterloo] "A New Future for the Kitchener – Waterloo Symphony Orchestra." (Armenian, Cole, Noble)

1986 [O.A.C.] "Program Evaluation: Music Commissioning." (Houlton)

1987 [O.A.C.] "Guidelines for Support: Community Orchestras and Professional Orchestras." (Creech & LaLeune)

1988 [O.A.C.] "Moving Forward: Five – Year Strategic Plan Prepared by Ontario Arts Council." (O.A.C.)

1.3. METHODOLOGY

1.3.1. STAGE 1: DECEMBER 1987

The study was initiated with a survey of the literature, 1963 – 1988, the collection of necessary materials and a first round of interviews with selected music directors and administrators from Hamilton, Sudbury, Kitchener – Waterloo, London, Toronto and Nepean. In addition, lengthy interviews were scheduled with Ezra Schabas, author of the 1966 **Report**, and Franz Kraemer former Head, Music Section of the Canada Council.

1.3.2. STAGE 2: JANUARY 1988

On the basis of these discussions, four questionnaires were prepared for the board chairpersons, administrators, music directors and the musicians. In the first three, the questionnaire formed the basis for structured field interviews which were taped and transcribed. The musicians' questionnaire was distributed to approximately 1,000 performers, amateur and professional. It was to be answered individually and administrators were asked to collect and forward them to the O.A.C.

1.3.3. STAGE 3: FEBRUARY – APRIL 1988

The following field interviews were completed as indicated below. They total approximately 100 hours of discussion on the basis of the relevant questionnaire. With two exceptions, there was maximum co – operation from conductors, administrators and board chairpersons.

ORCHESTRA	INTERVIEWED	DATE
Amadeus	manager	May 4
Brantford	conductor	March 18
Cathedral Bluffs	conductor	March 12
Chamber Players	manager	April 19
CJRT	conductor	May 3
Concert Players	conductor	April 12
	manager	April 12
	board chairperson	April 11
Deep River	conductor	April 2
Eastern Ontario	conductor	March 27
East York	board chairperson	March 31
	conductor	March 31
	manager	April 8
Etobicoke	manager	April 18
Esprit	conductor	April 25*
Georgian Bay	conductor	March 31
Hamilton	board chairperson	April 8
	conductor	February 12
	manager	March 31
Huronia	conductor	April 13
International	board chairperson	March 4
	conductor	March 4
	manager	March 4
Kingston	conductor	March 19
	manager	March 19
K - W	board chairperson	March 18
	conductor	April 7
	manager	March 29
K - W Chamber	board chairperson	April 4
	conductor	April 4
	manager	April 4
K - W Community	board chairperson	April 7
	conductor	March 30
	manager	April 7
McMaster	conductor	March 28
Mississauga	conductor	March 21
	manager	March 10
Nepean	conductor	April 2
Niagara	board chairperson	March 12
	manager	March 12
North Bay	board chairperson	April 14
	conductor	April 14
	manager	April 14
North York	conductor	March 31
Northumberland	conductor	March 19
Northwestern (T.Bay)	conductor	March 10
	manager	February 27
Orchestra London	board chairperson	February 5
	manager	April 8
	manager	March 20

ORCHESTRA	INTERVIEWED	DATE
Oshawa	manager	March 20
Ottawa	concertmaster	April 3
	conductor	April 12
	concertmaster	April 3
	past president	April 2
	past president	April 2
Oakville	conductor	April 8
Peterborough	conductor	March 4
Sault Ste. Marie	board chairperson	April 14
	conductor	April 14
Scarborough	board chairperson	April 20
	conductor	April 20
	manager	April 20
Sudbury	board chairperson	April 15
	conductor	April 15
	manager	April 15
Tafelmusik	board chairperson	April 19
	conductor	April 18
	manager	April 18
Te Deum	conductor	March 29
	manager	March 29
Thirteen Strings	conductor	April 12
Timmins	board chairperson	April 16
	conductor	April 16
	past president	April 16
Toronto Chinese	manager	April 11
Woodstock Strings	board chairperson	March 30
	conductor	March 28
York	conductor	March 12
Windsor	board chairperson	April 6
	conductor	March 10
	manager	April 6
	past president	April 6

* cancelled by the conductor

1.3.4. STAGE 4

After a substantial number of interviews had been completed, a soundings session was organized at the O.A.C. on April 9 with the following participants representing the diversity of Ontario orchestras: Dorothy Beckel [Ottawa], Boris Brott [Hamilton], Barry Cole [K – W], Ottie Lockey [Tafelmusik], John McDougall [Kingston], David Pearson [Sudbury], Philip Schaus [Cobourg], Guy Traficante [Sault Ste. Marie], Winston Webber [Oshawa], Betty Webster [O.F.S.O.] and Jim Wegg [Nepean]. Also in attendance, as observers, were Gwenlyn Setterfield and Michael LaLeune [O.A.C. Music Officers].

The soundings session discussed the problems and issues that had emerged in the course of the study.

1.3.5. STAGE 5

On the basis of the interviews, a consideration of the literature and the soundings session, a report was prepared that would provide the historical context for orchestral development in Ontario over the past 20 years and then articulate current problems with recommendations, funding requirements and a time line for implementation.

1.4. DEFINITIONS

To attempt definitions in the performing arts is close to a contradiction in terms, more often producing subjective argument than objective understanding. The best that can be hoped for are rough working definitions with the knowledge that any efforts along this line are for discussion only and as musical life changes, so may their meaning evolve.

. amateur musician: any orchestral musician who performs in an orchestra as a pastime rather than as a profession.

. audience constituency: the maximum potential audience that can be said to have reasonable access to an orchestra's performances. This must not be confused with total population in an area served by an orchestra.

. community orchestra: has been defined by the O.A.C. as orchestras which consist of a mix of amateur and professional musicians (unpaid and paid players). For funding purposes this term has developed perjorative connotations and should therefore be abandoned.

. community service: any activity, carried out under the auspices of the orchestra, contributing to the general musical life of the community which it serves, regardless of whether its point of reference is the local community, the provincial community at large or the musical community of the country.

. community support: any means by which the community as an entity, or its members individually, contribute to the support of the orchestra.

. earned revenue: all revenue earned by the orchestra as a result of ticket sales, other sales of the services of

the orchestra and/or its musicians and articles or goods sold by the orchestra.

. government revenue: all revenue received by the orchestra in the form of grants or subventions from any level of government, government agency or government commission.

. imported musician: an orchestra musician performing in a community other than the one which he or she is a resident.

. local musician: an orchestra musician residing and performing in the same community.

. orchestra: a musical entity which provides a yearly concert season of repertoire from the generally accepted symphonic literature (not played in transcription) with a continuing membership that distinguishes it from freelance pick – up groups.

. orchestral musician: a performer on any instrument who is a member of an orchestra giving performances.

. philharmonic: a society of music lovers [although not used in this study, if a term is required for orchestras other than those which play a 52 week season, this traditional term provides a strong alternative.]

.private revenue: all revenue received by the orchestra in the form of grants or donations from individuals, corporations or foundations.

. professional musician: any orchestral musician who performs in an orchestra and/or teaches as a profession rather than a pastime.

. professional orchestra: has been defined by the O.A.C. as an orchestra where members are either professionally contracted or a mixture of professionally contracted musicians or per service musicians, all being paid professional fees.

SECTION 2

2. THE EVOLUTION OF PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR ORCHESTRAS IN ONTARIO

Public acceptance of a role for government in funding the arts, of the notion that governments do have a shared responsibility for a nation's cultural development, has had a long tradition in Europe, a tradition that did not easily transfer to North America. The "least government is the best government" political philosophy that has dominated so much of United States history has had a pervasive effect in limiting access of the arts to government funding in that country, although it most certainly has also contributed to an acceptance of responsibility for private support in the form of large endowments. As in so many other areas, support for the arts in Canada has developed, particularly since the Second World War, along the traditional path of compromise: some, but not too much, government support; some, but not too much, private support.

The result has been neither public ownership of performing arts companies nor huge endowments providing guaranteed annual income for these companies. What we have instead, is a system of "arm's length" funding, with the basic premise that government does have a responsibility for funding the arts, but that this can best be done by independent arts councils through which financial support can be channelled. This approach to funding, essentially following the example of the Arts Council of Great Britain, was recommended by the Massey Commission in 1951 and resulted in the formation of the Canada Council, the Ontario Arts Council and other provincial arts councils in the Atlantic Provinces and Western Canada.

2.1. PUBLIC SUPPORT AND THE O.A.C.

While it may be extravagant to claim that the growth in the number of Ontario orchestras, from 15 in 1963 to the more than 50 that exist today, was solely the result of "arm's length" funding policy, there can be no question that this policy has been enormously successful. In the 1965 – 66 season, a total of $43,800 was awarded to all orchestras in the province, including the Toronto Symphony. In the 1987 – 88 season, $1,825,300 was awarded to 35 orchestras, excluding the Toronto Symphony. The 13 community orchestras identified by Ezra Schabas in 1966 have now expanded to include 21 community and 14 professional funded orchestras, again

exclusive of the Toronto Symphony. Clearly the "arm's length" funding policy has prevented a politically-motivated centralization of funding support, and allowed the Council to respond to community aspirations for orchestral development in every region of the province. In the never-ending quest for a larger share of the cultural support money supply, some of the more powerful organizations have occasionally endeavoured to bypass the Council in rather short-sighted attempts to individually gain access, by intense lobbying, to what best can be described as possibly larger, but certainly more unstable sources of government funds. To the credit of the majority of cultural institutions and successive Ontario governments, these attempts to weaken the effectiveness of the Ontario Arts Council have been successfully resisted, and hopefully put permanently to rest by the 1984 Report of the Special Committee for the Arts.

> The Committee is convinced that the problems of providing funding for the major performing arts organizations must be solved within the present structure of arts granting in the province. Thus, direct ministerial grants to individual organizations, whether tax- or lottery-based, are not the answer, either in the short or the long term. Instead, funds should come from the Ontario Arts Council, and the Council must be put in a position to deal with these problems.[1]

In 1964, Milton Carman, the first Executive Director of the Council, spoke of his dream for a "Peace Corps of the arts", a scheme to send professional artists into small communities to "train and inspire".[2] The notion of "community artist" has, in one way or another, been a central theme in virtually every report written about, or by, the Arts Council, since the first music report on orchestras, prepared by Ezra Schabas in 1966.

---

[1] Ministry of Citizenship and Culture. Report of the Special Committee for the Arts, Robert W. Macaulay, Chairman, 1984, p. 9/20.

[2] MacsKimming, Roy, For Arts' Sake: A History of the Ontario Arts Council, 1963-1983, published Ontario Arts Council, 1983, p.23.

2.2. THE SCHABAS REPORT

Professor Schabas prepared, for the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts, the first "orchestral map" of the province, which, at that time, included 13 amateur and semi-professional orchestras, as well as the Toronto Symphony. He noted that there were no more than 25 professional musicians in Ontario, outside of Toronto, and that any professional musician venturing out of Toronto "must be prepared to take up a musical life of meaning in communities..."[3] (i.e. community musicians!). Schabas recommended that funding should be directed as follows:

1. The establishment of regional professional orchestras in the Niagara region and Eastern Ontario;

2. The placing of Resident Musicians in London, Sarnia, the Lakehead and Windsor;

3. The creation of travelling groups, using the "Music in Maine" project as a model.

Through the structure of touring ensembles, resident musicians and regional orchestras, Schabas predicted the evolution of community orchestras into full-time professional symphony orchestras in as many as 8 Ontario cities, and this is precisely what has happened in 4 of those communities: Hamilton, London, Kitchener-Waterloo and Thunder Bay. However, they have not become the 72 player orchestras that he viewed as the model symphony orchestra for these mid-size cities, but instead have evolved as highly professional full-time chamber orchestras which are augmented to larger symphony orchestras with the addition of part-time professionals. Other recommendations in the Schabas report were directed towards improving the quality of professional music and performance training, the training of managers, the improvement of orchestra boards and the encouragement of youth orchestras. But the focus of the report was on the development of Regional Orchestras and Resident Musician programs, through the use of professional community musicians, and this challenge was taken up by the Council and its first Music Officer, Walter Ball.

---

[3] Schabas, Ezra, "Ontario Community Orchestras. A Report for The Province of Ontario Council for the Arts and The Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras," 1966, p.11.

2.3. THE FIRST MUSIC OFFICER, WALTER BALL

Following the Ontario Music Conference at Lake Couchiching in 1966, the Council appointed its first Music Officer, Walter Ball. In a lengthy report that same year to the Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras, of which he was also Executive Director, Ball endorsed the recommendations of the **Schabas Report**. In particular, he noted the importance of developing "an indigenous musical life" in communities around the province, through the funding of a Resident Musician Plan. He suggested that such a plan would depend on the co-operation of orchestras, universities, schools, community colleges and private teachers in the community. In 1967 Resident Musicians were established in Kingston and the Lakehead, but some of the concerns expressed by Ball in his analysis of the inflexibility in educational forces, and difficulties between universities, public schools and orchestras were all too correct and the resident plan did not develop much further at that time.

2.4. PUBLIC SUPPORT IN AN EXPANDING ECONOMY, 1963-1975

Ezra Schabas had the advantage that his report was prepared at a time when the economy of Ontario was expanding rapidly, public acceptance of government funding for the arts was overwhelming and funding to the Arts Council from the government was increasing at an annual rate which was nothing short of phenomenal, especially when we consider the rate of increase in the 1980's. In actual dollars, the Council's annual appropriation from the government increased from $300,000 in 1963-64 to $9,495,000 in 1975-76. The annual percentage increases were as high as 66.7% in 1965-66, but after the 32.8% increase in 1975-76, the rate of increase dropped to 10.6% and, in many of the years since, has barely kept pace with the rate of inflation. It is therefore not surprising that much of the orchestral expansion proposed by Schabas was initiated in the 1966-1975 boom years, and that the Council encouraged further studies on orchestral expansion, such as the 1968 Applebaum Study on "Toronto's Orchestral Resources", and a further study by Schabas on the possibility for a new orchestra in Toronto, completed in 1976. However, the economic decline of the late 1970's had its inevitable effect on the arts, and at the same time that orchestra deficits began to escalate across the country, the rate of increased funding support dropped dramatically.

2.5. PUBLIC SUPPORT IN A RESTRAINED ECONOMY: 1975 – 1986

The rate of increased funding from the government to the Arts Council dropped dramatically after 1975 – 76, and in 1979 – 80 reached a low of 2%. Orchestras which were locked into escalating contractual commitments scrambled to seek alternative sources of funding, but deficits grew at an alarming rate. In 1979, Franz Kraemer, Head of the Music Section of the Canada Council, noted that all 15 orchestras funded by the Canada Council were in a deficit situation and recommended that no new orchestras be added to the list of those receiving operating grants from the Canada Council. In Ontario, the policy of the Canada Council put further pressure for increased support on the Ontario Arts Council at a time when it was having its own difficulties in funding clients. A number of reports, commissioned by the Arts Council and by the Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras, as well as individual orchestras, attempted to deal with various aspects of the common theme; how to maintain the well – established and widely supported Ontario orchestra community at a time when government financial support was annually decreasing in real dollar value.

In retrospect, the imposed financial restraints produced some far – reaching and beneficial results. Orchestras were forced to look more into their own communities for support and levels of private and municipal funding began to increase. For example, the overall increase of local government support for orchestras rose from $685,526 to $1,330,005, or 94.01%, between 1983 and 1987; this represents an increase in the proportion of local funding to expense budgets, from 8.62% in 1983 to 9.86% in 1987.

In addition to seeking alternative sources of funding, orchestras also began to look closely at their own administrative and board responsibilities. The 1980 O.F.S.O. Task Force "Report" examined the far – too – frequently neglected areas of orchestra planning, marketing, management, board of directors and the controversial subject, artistic excellence. This Report recommended a much closer examination of fixed costs, improved planning, recognition of fiscal responsibility on the part of boards, a greater marketing effort and more community involvement at all levels. Of particular significance was an innovative suggestion for deficit reduction and control. This recommendation would have involved the government, through Wintario, in a program which would enable debt ridden orchestras to gradually eliminate their deficits in a responsible manner, without transferring their fiscal obligations to funding agencies.

In a later section of this report, we will be dealing with a somewhat similar proposal for deficit reduction.

In 1984, Dr. Geoffrey Wall and Clare Mitchell of the University of Waterloo summarized the effect that orchestras were having on four Canadian communities, Kitchener – Waterloo, Lethbridge, Quebec and Toronto, for the Association of Canadian Orchestras and the Council for Business and the Arts in Canada. This report substantially confirmed that orchestra activity in Canada, in spite of years of restraint, was a permanent and vital aspect of community life, with major socio – economic impact.

2.6. GROWTH AND RESTRAINT: 1986 – 1988

Partially in response to 10 years of limited funding flexibility, the Music Office of the Ontario Arts Council produced, in 1985, a comprehensive paper, "The Orchestra and the Community", which established funding guidelines and policies which were to be in effect until a thorough review of all Arts Council programs produced long – range plans for the future. The recommendations in the paper, later approved by the Council, included a limitation on further funding to community orchestras and substantially no change in granting policies for professional orchestras. Nevertheless, the paper did recognize the entrenched relationship between the community and the orchestra, a relationship which was identified by Schabas and emphasized in all subsequent reports.

What was beginning to emerge as a major difference, was the concept that community musicians were becoming a new and renaissance type professional activist in the cultural life of the community; a concept which promised possibilities for permanent careers in many of these communities. Professional positions in small and mid – size communities were no longer, necessarily, transient training opportunities for young musicians looking for eventual placement in major symphony orchestras. Old methods of orchestral training were about to be replaced with new, more relevant, concepts of comprehensive individual training in performance and communications.

2.7. A CHANGING ROLE FOR THE O.A.C.

When we began the research for this study in December, 1987, we were prepared to produce a report which, if not an obituary for the symphony orchestra, would, at the

very least, prepare the way for a rationalization and possible reduction of orchestral resources in Ontario. It seemed, from initial reports, that orchestras were collapsing everywhere in North America, that audiences were disappearing, that higher levels of financial support were virtually non-existent and that public confrontation between management and musicians was becoming the usual pattern in contract negotiations.

There was no question that there were indeed serious problems in the United States. Orchestras were either on strike, on the point of bankruptcy or had already collapsed, in Boston, Columbus, Detroit, Oakland, San Diego and New Orleans, to name only a few. In Canada, the Vancouver Symphony was on the point of bankruptcy, with a reduction of 50% in its audience, and the Thunder Bay and Windsor Symphony Orchestras were fast approaching impossible deficit levels.

Ernest Fleishmann's address to the Cleveland Institute of Music in May, 1987, in which he hypothesized that "The Orchestra is Dead. Long Live the Community of Musicians", articulated the disastrous orchestral situation in North America. If indeed the orchestra was dead in Los Angeles, how could it possibly survive in smaller communities?

At this point in our thinking, we began our visits to the orchestras in Ontario and slowly an entirely new picture emerged. Instead of the disasters which were so publicized, we found incredible enthusiasm and support in virtually every community we visited. In Kingston, we were part of a capacity audience which enjoyed every minute of a premiere performance of a Canadian composition. In Cobourg, a small community of 10,000 people, we heard a very credible performance of Mendelssohn's Elijah. In Timmins, we listened, along with over two hundred other people, to an enjoyable evening of string chamber music. In Brantford, we sat in a beautiful old theatre, soon to be restored, as the orchestra performed a truly professional quality all Beethoven program.

Everywhere we went it was the same. The intense desire of musicians, amateur as well as professional, to perform was matched by the enthusiasm of boards and administrators, most often working with extremely limited resources, except the ultimately superior inner resource of pride in belonging and contributing in some way to the cultural enrichment of their community.

We now share that enthusiasm and optimism, although we do question some of the assumptions and proposals we have heard. For example, is it correct that a symphony should be evaluated primarily in musical terms? Is it possible to define excellence? Is it punitive for all orchestras receiving public money to perform 10% Canadian content in their programs (when this is the only way for composers to have effective access to the same kind of subsidy that orchestras expect)?

These and many other issues will be raised in the sections of this report dealing with specific recommendations. Perhaps it would be appropriate to close this section with the suggestion that the "Community of Musicians" proposed by Fleischmann is alive and well in Ontario, particularly in the small communities where he doubted that such a "Community of Musicians" could possibly exist!

The most recent report produced by the Ontario Arts Council is a Five-year Strategic Plan, "Moving Forward". This plan lists 4 principal goals for the Arts Council in the next five years:

1. To enhance financial stability and growth in the arts sector, particularly through multi-year funding;

2. To improve access and community development through improved linkages between amateurs and professionals and an expanded presence for the Ontario Arts Council;

3. To enhance artistic development and growth, particularly through professional development and training;

4. To encourage art research and promotion, particularly through an advocacy role for the Ontario Arts Council.

We believe that the recommendations of the following three sections are consistent with the four goals as expressed by the Ontario Arts Council.

SECTION 3

3. THE O.A.C. & THE ORCHESTRAL COMMUNITY OF ONTARIO

3.1. DOCUMENTATION FOR FUNDING SUPPORT

3.1.1. PROBLEM

The majority of Ontario orchestras do not presently have clearly articulated documents which provide the conceptual structure within which the orchestra carries out its mission, attempts to reach its stated objectives and plans for its long-term development.

3.1.2. DISCUSSION

Of 45 orchestras covered in the present report, most do not currently have a long-term plan. In some instances, a brief mission statement is included in the articles of incorporation but, in general, a clear statement of the orchestra's objectives in terms of audience development, community service, etc., is not available.

3.1.3. RECOMMENDATION

That each orchestra applying for funding will develop, in consultation with the O.A.C., four documents: a mission statement; an artistic policy, a plan for the current year which includes complete budget data and a long-term plan for the development of the orchestra.

3.1.4. FUNDING

More time will need to be available for Music Section officers to work with individual orchestras in developing this basic documentation.

3.1.5. TIME LINE

The plan for the current year must be submitted with the next grant application. Mission statement, artistic policy and long-term plan should be completed within the first year of implementation of this report.

3.2. CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENTS FOR FUNDING

3.2.1. PROBLEM

There are as many varying sets of objectives as there are orchestras in Ontario today. Without clearly stated objectives for each orchestra, it is impossible to arrive at a basis for mutual agreement between the O.A.C. and the orchestra as to whether or not the orchestra is meeting its objectives.

3.2.2. DISCUSSION

There is no uniform set of objectives which can apply to any 2 orchestras, much less to a group of orchestras of similar size and capability. For example, one orchestra may have as one of its objectives the provision of performance opportunities for mature students; another may be interested primarily in providing performing opportunities for amateurs in the community; a third may wish to provide an opportunity for retired professional musicians. All of these objectives may be equally acceptable, but not all may necessarily be adopted by a single orchestra as its objectives. The O.A.C. should include in its assessment only the stated objectives of the orchestra, provided that the objectives fall within the O.A.C. guidelines which are used to determine financial and administrative accountability, artistic achievement, community support and community service.

3.2.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the result of an orchestra's documentation and discussions with the O.A.C. will be a contract to meet the agreed objectives of the orchestra in return for funding support.

3.2.4. FUNDING

Music officers will require time to negotiate and complete contractual commitments which will form the basis of assessment for funding support.

3.2.5. TIME LINE

The contract between the orchestra and the O.A.C. must be submitted along with the next grant application.

3.3. BOARD RESPONSIBILITY

3.3.1. PROBLEM

With some notable exceptions, most Boards of Directors of Ontario orchestras function in a reactive rather than a proactive mode. They are not able to, nor do not wish to, take a firm leadership role in developing and protecting the mission or the artistic policy of the orchestra. The result is that, far too often, they find themselves in the position of being forced to react to a crisis situation.

3.3.2. DISCUSSION

In very few situations does the Board actually take the initiative in developing the objectives which form part of the commitment for funding support, and subsequently accepting responsibility for the success or failure to meet these objectives. For example, one orchestra failed to

meet its fund – raising objectives, but the Board left it to the part – time general manager to develop alternatives and present these to the O.A.C. In other cases, the Board refused to take responsibility for the successful negotiation of union contracts which were within the orchestra's financial capability. The O.A.C. must have a guaranteed commitment for responsibility before it releases public funds.

3.3.3. RECOMMENDATION

That final responsibility for initiating and fulfilling a contractual commitment for funding support between each orchestra and the O.A.C. rests with the orchestra's Board of Directors. No further Council funding will be considered without that contractual commitment from the Board of Directors.

3.3.4. FUNDING

There are no additional financial implications for the O.A.C.

3.3.5. TIME LINE

The Board of Directors must agree to accept full responsibility for the commitments as outlined in 3.2.2.

3.4. CLASSIFICATION VS. LOCAL INITIATIVE

3.4.1. PROBLEM

Present classification systems used to place orchestras in a pre – determined hierarchical structure tend to erect a de facto "class" system of orchestras, with its attendant rigidity and inflexibility of movement. Orchestras become categorized by remote judgments which often bear little resemblance to the value of the orchestra to the community.

3.4.2. DISCUSSION

We have examined the classification systems used by the American Symphony Orchestra League, the Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras, the Canada Council and the descriptive system of the Ontario Arts Council. We also examined classification systems as they operate in Europe. In general, we found that the procedure presently used by the O.A.C. the least bureaucratic, allowing for the greatest flexibility in movement. What is missing is input from each orchestra, at regular intervals, in determining its unique position in the orchestral life of the Province.

3.4.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the present descriptive divisions of orchestras currently used by the O.A.C. (major, professional, community), each with its attendant set of guidelines for grant assessment, be modified to allow for greater flexibility and input on the part of each orchestra, recognizing the individuality of each and with different weightings for the four essential components: administrative and fiscal responsibility, community service, artistic achievement and community support.

3.4.4. FUNDING

The music officers will require more time to provide the necessary attention to each orchestra.

3.4.5. TIME LINE

There are no time parameters, as the placement of orchestras will fluctuate constantly and be determined largely by the orchestra's own initiatives.

3.5. EVALUATION

3.5.1. PROBLEM

Evaluation of an orchestra in a fair way, that takes into account its unique response to the various communities it may serve and the way in which it organizes itself to do this, is a difficult problem.

3.5.2. DISCUSSION

An orchestra may serve not only its local community, but the larger community of the province and/or the musical community. How it defines its role in response to the needs of these different communities, determines its specific nature. This poses a problem for a granting agency in that it is virtually impossible to devise a single set of evaluation guidelines which are applicable in all instances.

An alternative approach is to relate evaluation to the orchestra's own definition of its role, its objectives, how it handles the administrative and financial foundations which allow for its existence, and its plans for future growth.

Since public money is being requested, however, the process of determining this basic documentation should include the O.A.C. and the orchestra as partners who, through a process of interaction and negotiation, find a consensus which takes into account the four main parameters within which a working definition may be developed: artistic achievement, fiscal responsibility, community service and community support.

Of these four major components, only fiscal responsibility admits to common requirements from all orchestras. For the others, it is important to understand that not all orchestras will place artistic achievement as their priority. Also, community service and support may appear in a variety of forms. It follows that evaluation for grant purposes should be based on a statement of objectives and plans acceptable to both the orchestra and the O.A.C. Evaluation from orchestra to orchestra will depend on the priorities established, through the process of discussion and negotiation, by the two parties concerned.

3.5.3. RECOMMENDATION

That evaluation should rest on the documents dealing with mission, artistic policy and long-term plan. The four central components should be artistic achievement, fiscal responsibility, community service and community support. The relative weight given to each of these will form part of the basic documentation for the orchestra, and should be the result of negotiation and consensus between the orchestra and the O.A.C.

3.5.4. FUNDING

Music officers will require time to work with each orchestra in developing the basis for what is to be evaluated.

3.5.5. TIME LINE

This is a process which will take time. It should be commenced immediately and the consensus should be in place by the end of the first year following the implementation of this report.

3.6. A MATRIX SYSTEM

3.6.1. PROBLEM

While each orchestra is unique, there remains a need to develop a quantitative procedure which can define, quite specifically, the placement of that orchestra in relation to the four dimensions of its existence: community support, community service, fiscal responsibility and artistic achievement.

3.6.2. DISCUSSION

During the soundings session "Orchestra 2001", there was much interest in a multi-dimensional matrix system which would not only provide for the placement of an orchestra

in relation to the four central dimensions of its existence, but which would also provide a record of its growth over time.

Because of the interest which emerged during the soundings session, this topic was pursued with David Pearson, Board Chairman of the Sudbury Symphony and a major figure in the development of Science North. Such an approach holds considerable potential for combining the need for flexibility with the need for quantitative assessment and placement of each individual orchestra. Unfortunately, the development of such a model was not possible in the time available for this study, nor within the professional expertise of its authors.

3.6.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C., in consultation with the orchestral community and an expert in matrix design, should prepare, during the first three – year cycle, a system based on community support, community service, fiscal responsibility and artistic achievement for assessing applications for grant assistance and recording orchestral development.

3.6.4. FUNDING

Implementation of this recommendation will require the services of a consultant to develop the design according to the needs of the O.A.C. and the orchestral community. It will also require the expenses of a meeting of the O.A.C., consultant and representatives of the orchestral community to discuss what it is, how it operates, and how it will be used.

3.6.5. TIME LINE

Preparation of the matrix system, and the subsequent preparation of the orchestral community for the implementation of the matrix system, will require substantial time. By year two of the first three – year cycle, the system should be ready for piloting with a small number of orchestras. After working out any problems which emerge during this initial trial run, the revised system should be ready for general implementation by the end of the first three – year cycle.

3.7. GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND GUIDELINES

3.7.1. PROBLEM

The two sets of guidelines used to assess the two categories of orchestras currently described by the O.A.C., "professional" and "community", have been developed as a series of questions which, in effect, outline the appropriate kinds of activities and responsibilities for each orchestra in its own community. In our discussions with 52 administrators and board chairpersons from every area in the province, it became clear that there was a general lack of understanding of how the guidelines were applied in the assessment process, how the individual orchestra could develop a set of goals and objectives which would enhance its assessment through the guidelines, and how each orchestra could respond to provincial standards where applicable, while simultaneously responding positively to local priorities.

3.7.2. DISCUSSION

In most cases, the guidelines outlined by the Council can be applicable for both "professional" and "community" orchestras, as they have been defined in the past. Nevertheless, the relative weight attached to a wide range of priorities can, and should, vary considerably from orchestra to orchestra, as indeed should the actual meaning and intent of a particular guideline.

One example is "level of artistic achievement". The Canada Council has consistently argued for a granting policy based on a national standard for artistic excellence, with an assessment of this standard of excellence coming from a central source. It is our position that this form of centralized decision – making is unworkable and historically invalid, and should not be applied in Ontario by the O.A.C. Communities across the province have resisted attempts to develop centralized control in almost every sphere of activity, and in the arts they have overwhelmingly supported local initiative in preference to regional or provincial authority.

The O.A.C. has developed mechanisms which recognize the intensity of local initiatives and, in fact, we found throughout the province, a favorable reaction to the O.A.C. and a feeling that it is much more responsive to local initiative and ideals than the Canada Council. However, it is our position that the process of local involvement with the O.A.C. can be substantially enhanced by direct interaction between the community and the Music Officers in the development of objectives

and guidelines for each individual community, using the existing guidelines as a starting point.

3.7.3. RECOMMENDATION

That, to assist orchestras in understanding the evaluation process, an illustrative set of potential goals, objectives and guidelines for determining achievement of various kinds, plus definition of fiscal responsibility, community service and community support be drawn up and used as a starting point in the interaction between orchestras and the O.A.C.

3.7.4. FUNDING

The Music Office will require time from Music Officers to assist each orchestra in the development of individual goals, objectives and guidelines.

3.7.5. TIME LINE

The goals, objectives and guidelines used for determining an assessment for O.A.C. support should be available prior to the next grant application deadline following the adoption of these recommendations.

3.8. THE AUDIENCE CONSTITUENCY

3.8.1. PROBLEM

Each member of OFSO is asked to define its potential audience. This is the portion of the total population formed by the catchment area which the orchestra serves. At present, there is no common procedure for defining either the catchment area population or the potential audience.

3.8.2. DISCUSSION

The extent of variability in determining potential audience is shown in these figures submitted by five large budget orchestras:

POTENTIAL AUDIENCE

CITY	CMA	OFSO	POT.AUD.	%
Hamilton	315,200	310,000	39,140	13%
K – W	207,400	211,549	21,440	10%
London	259,500	275,000	23,128	8%
Thun. Bay	108,500	120,000	8,178	7%
Windsor	197,200	244,000	14,316	6%

In this table, CMA refers to Census Metropolitan Areas as published in the Financial Post's Canadian Markets 1986. OFSO shows the figures returned to OFSO for the orchestra's catchment area. POT.AUD. shows the orchestra's reported potential audience. The final column shows the potential audience as a percentage of the orchestra's total population data. Using only the data provided by these five orchestras, the percentage of potential audience to catchment area varies from 6% to 13%.

If CMA figures are used for catchment areas, instead of orchestral estimates of catchment population, the range narrows from 7% to 12%.

Potential audience depends on many variables: size of concert hall, number of concerts, population of the catchment area, etc. Determination of this, however, should be addressed carefully by each orchestra. If the potential audience, as in the case of Windsor, is a relatively low percentage of the catchment population, the reasons for this should be spelled out and included in the basic documentation for the orchestra.

3.8.3. RECOMMENDATION

That as part of its mission statement, each orchestra will be asked to realistically define its potential audience constituency.

3.8.4. FUNDING

Not required.

3.8.5. TIME LINE

Should be undertaken immediately.

3.9. COMMUNITY ORCHESTRAS BECOME ONTARIO ORCHESTRAS

3.9.1.PROBLEM

In 1985, the demands for substantial grant increases from existing clients and requests for funding from potential new clients forced the O.A.C. to re-examine its existing policies, particularly as the funds available for distribution by the O.A.C. were not keeping pace with inflation, let alone demand. In "The Orchestra and the Community", a paper prepared for the O.A.C. by the Music Office, the following recommendations were made concerning "community" orchestras:

> That this support be tied directly to the professional artistic costs of the orchestra:

Grants will not exceed 25% of the total professional artistic costs to a maximum of $15,000 per year, whichever is less, to orchestras in southern Ontario.

Grants will not exceed 40% of the total professional artistic costs to a maximum of $15,000 per year, whichever is less, to orchestras in northern Ontario, (i.e. north of the Matawa Line).

That grants to community orchestras be clearly identified as project grants...

3.9.2. DISCUSSION

The positive effect of the restrictions placed on funding for community orchestras has been a general and desireable equalization of treatment for all "community" orchestras. This has resulted in the possibility of "catch – up" for orchestras, within the descriptive category of "community orchestras", which had been relatively under – funded.

However, it has also created a different kind of inequality; orchestras with great initiative and potential for professional growth have been limited to a level of funding set by the freeze and their description as "community orchestras". Examples of these are Ottawa, Sarnia and Sudbury, although in the case of Sudbury, resident musician project grants enabled the orchestra to exceed the $15,000 limit. However, this in its own way created another inequality with orchestras who were not in a position to access this program or for whom the resident musician concept was not appropriate.

In all cases, the "community" designation of an orchestra and the resulting restriction to project funding has inhibited the possibility for funding increases, even when it is warranted on all other grounds. This has not been the case with "professional" orchestras.

Considering the diverse possibilities for supporting an orchestra in a given community, linking grants to professional components only, has also created anomalies, the arguments for which it is difficult to answer. The following examples indicate the disparity between budgets, grants and number of professionals performing in orchestras with a comparable degree of activity.

CITY	NO.PAID REGULAR PROF.	NO.PAID OCCAS. PROF.	87/88 BUDGET	87/88 GRANT
Brantford	36	40	102,150	10,000
McMaster	6	11	76,025	5,500
Mississ.	8	0	235,550	15,000
N. York	5	0	162,951	14,000
Oshawa	40	5	99,405	9,900
Ottawa	85	0	206,543	15,000
Sudbury	7	20	135,692	27,000

This compares unfavorably with the following examples of orchestras which have a professional designation and a consequent greater access to funding.

CITY	NO.PAID REGULAR PROF.	87/88 BUDGET	87/88 GRANT
Kingston	60	381,593	85,000
Nepean	35	387,933	48,000
Niagara	65	305,630	68,000

3.9.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the funding ceiling for orchestras described by the term "community" and the requirement that Council support be tied directly to professional artists be dropped immediately and that all orchestras be eligible for operating grant funding on the same basis.

3.9.4. FUNDING

Later in this report, we are recommending that all orchestras be eligible for a maximum of 102%, 104% and 106% of New Cycle Base Funding in operating grants for each year, in a three year cycle. Providing that all "community" orchestras presently receiving project grants qualify to have their current grants designated as operating grants, and are eligible for the maximum increase, funding from the Council for orchestras presently designated as "community" would increase as follows:

YEAR	NCBF	INCREASE %	INCREASE $	MAX. OP. GRANT
87 – 88	181,000	–	–	181,800
88 – 89	181,000	102%	3,636	185,436
89 – 90	181,000	104%	7,272	189,072
90 – 91	181,000	106%	10,908	192,708

Total increase in funding required over a three-year period is $21,816.

The cost is small but the effect would be to give all orchestras the opportunity, through their own efforts, to progress on the basis of equal treatment.

3.9.5. TIME LINE

The funding ceiling on community orchestras, the tie-in of support to professional artists, and the restrictions prohibiting operating grants, can all be eliminated for the next grant year.

3.10. NEW ORCHESTRA PROGRAM

3.10.1. PROBLEM

The explosive growth of interest and capability in the performance of orchestral music over the past 20 years has resulted in requests for O.A.C. financial involvement beyond a freeze on funding for new orchestras and a low priority for multiple orchestras in a community, until a general review of changed conditions and new operating procedures could be completed. The freeze and low priority for multiple orchestras in a community is unacceptable within the traditions of the O.A.C.'s support for local initiative.

3.10.2. DISCUSSION

A cultural phenomenon of the past two decades is the burgeoning desire on the part of many communities to have their own orchestra. At the same time, even where there currently exists an orchestra of professional capability, there has developed a strong need to provide an outlet for both amateur and professional musicians who are not members of the professional orchestra. Along with this, the growing sophistication of audiences has resulted in the emergence of specialized orchestras which broaden the range of repertoire opportunity for Ontarians.

In Metro Toronto, from Mississauga to East York and Scarborough, local orchestras which play an important role in the musical life of their communities, have emerged. In Kitchener-Waterloo, Hamilton, Windsor and London, all cities which now boast orchestras with professional capability, other orchestras playing a different role in the music resources available to the community have materialized: Te Deum in Dundas specializes in baroque repertoire; the Concert Players Orchestra in London is an integral part of a large community choral society; Kitchener hosts, in addition to

its symphony, a respectable chamber orchestra made up primarily of professional musicians not in the symphony and a community orchestra which provides an outlet for the same kind of grass roots music-making which laid the groundwork for the emergence of a professional symphony in the 1970's.

This is local initiative at its musical best and deserves recognition and involvement of the O.A.C. At the same time, it is reasonable for the O.A.C. to establish criteria for entrance to the funded orchestral community. Such a list of criteria might include the following:

. 3 years continuous and successful operation
. registration as a non-profit organization
. development of required basic documentation
. evidence of financial responsibility
. evidence of growing community support
. evidence of community service
. development of an effective board
. definition of potential audience

3.10.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the freeze on the funding for new orchestras and multiple orchestras in a community be removed immediately. All orchestras, whether currently funded or not, should be eligible for funding within the parameters of the new guidelines.

That a New Orchestra Program be established with the necessary mechanisms to determine eligibility criteria, assessment procedures and a list of potential goals and objectives.

3.10.4. FUNDING

For any currently non-funded orchestra that meets the funding eligibility criteria, there will be a New Orchestra Project grant of $1,000, upon acceptance of the orchestra by the O.A.C. This project grant may increase to $3,000 by the final year in the orchestra's first three-year cycle.

At the successful completion of its first three-year cycle, the new orchestra then becomes eligible for an initial operating grant at the level of its funding in the final year of its New Orchestra Project funding.

Given the current backlog of orchestras requesting assistance, a minimum of $75,000 in new money should be made available over the next 3 years. At the conclusion of the first three-year period, when the project grant becomes the operating grant, it will be necessary for an

incorporation of this former project grant total into confirmed new operating money in the total funds available to the support of orchestral development.

There will be a continuing need for new money for the support of new orchestras, although at a somewhat reduced rate for the foreseeable future.

While the financial requirements for a new orchestra with a large professional component are much heavier than for one with a more limited professional involvement, any increase of funding in excess of the initial grants made available under the New Orchestra Program will have to depend upon that orchestra establishing its unique contribution to the provincial orchestral community and the availability of new money from the Ministry for this express purpose.

3.10.5. TIME LINE

The development of an acceptable set of criteria for new orchestra funding eligibility, and assessment procedures, should proceed immediately. When this is completed, those orchestras which have been denied funding should be informed of new developments and invited to apply again when they have completed the new requirements.

3.11. INNOVATION/RISK PROGRAM

3.11.1. PROBLEM

There is presently no financial support for an orchestra which would like to take an innovative initiative carrying a high risk factor. As a result, orchestras which would like to attempt programs or activities that hold potential for developing new audiences, or for addressing a range of other problems, simply cannot take the chance.

3.11.1 DISCUSSION

While the orchestral scene in Ontario is one of vitality and growth, certain problem areas have emerged over the past 2 decades that are not easily solved. Audience development, for example, in terms of educational programming and adult education, is essential for the future health of Ontario orchestras. Efforts are being made in this area but the kind of bold experimentation that might result in communication and growth breakthroughs, in a form that could be utilized by the whole orchestral community, seldom happens.

It is commonplace in the business community for funds to be allocated for research and development. By and large, this capability has been largely absent from the

orchestral world and with good reason, given their continual struggle to stay financially afloat, without incurring an unmanageable deficit. The only possibility for orchestras to attempt new solutions to problems or explore new directions would be the availability of financial assistance, possibly on a matching dollar basis with the O.A.C.

The importance of an Innovation/Risk Project Grant program should be considered a high priority by the O.A.C. Since not all orchestras could be serviced immediately, an advisory committee, drawn from the orchestral community, should select those submissions which are most carefully prepared and which hold the highest potential for success. All orchestras proposing to undertake a positive initiative would be considered by this advisory committee.

3.11.2. RECOMMENDATION

That an Innovation/Risk Program be established immediately with a procedure acceptable to the orchestral community for evaluating the merit of proposals.

3.11.3. FUNDING

New money to the extent of $125,000 will be necessary for funding this program. When combined with an orchestra's contribution on a matching dollar basis, this is approximately 10% of the total grant money now available and 2% of the orchestra community's combined total budget of some $12,700,000 for 1986 – 87.[1]

3.11.4. TIME LINE

This program and the selection of a representative advisory committee should be implemented immediately.

3.12. PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR REMOTE COMMUNITIES

3.12.1. PROBLEM

There are now resource pools of professional musicians in Toronto, Hamilton, London, Kitchener – Waterloo, Thunder Bay and Windsor. Many orchestras have access to these professional pools in terms of reasonable travelling time for musicians and the attendant costs. For some orchestras, however, long distances from a professional pool means much financial difficulty in importing both soloists and key instrumentalists necessary to their concert season. This is particularly true of the northern

---

[1] This does not include the Toronto Symphony.

orchestras, Timmins, North Bay, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury, but the same problem applies to the more isolated southern orchestras such as Belleville and Georgian Bay.

3.12.2. DISCUSSION

While most of the orchestras in Ontario have access to professional musicians from the 6 current resource pools, a small number of active and vital orchestras do not. If a goal of the O.A.C. is to make orchestral development accessible to all parts of the province, regardless of geography, additional assistance should be made available to cover travel costs of key professional musicians on an occasional basis.

This could likely be accomplished in the form of a Isolation Travel Assistance Project program which would establish a sliding scale arrangement for travel assistance to professional musicians, based on the distance of an orchestra from a resource pool. Travelling time of 90 minutes and/or a distance of 100 kilometers seems a reasonable starting point for the provision of travel assistance by the Council. The figures for the sliding scale of assistance should be drawn on the basis of actual cost to orchestras combined with the number of musicians used.

3.12.3. RECOMMENDATION

That an Isolation Travel Assistance fund be established for orchestras in remote centres in Ontario, to help meet travel costs in bringing soloists and orchestral musicians into these communities to fill agreed upon needs. Such assistance would be granted on an increasing scale depending on the distance from a major professional musician resource pool, and must be consistent with the orchestra's objectives.

3.12.4. FUNDING

An estimate of money required to address this problem is difficult at this time. Music section staff should develop a realistic appraisal of current needs of isolated orchestras and determine the guidelines for travel assistance.

3.12.5. TIME LINE

Work on ascertaining the need and establishing guidelines, should be in place for the beginning of the 1988 – 89 concert season.

3.13. RESIDENT MUSICIAN PROGRAM

3.13.1. PROBLEM

Proposals for resident musician programs are not new in Ontario. In 1966, Professor Schabas recommended, in his report for the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts, "Ontario Community Orchestras", that resident musician programs be established in London, Sarnia, Kitchener–Waterloo, Oshawa, the Lakehead and Windsor. In the 1970's, the Canada Council introduced a similar program in a number of Canadian communities. In spite of the generally accepted rationale for funding resident musicians in smaller communities, these programs met with mixed success until the most recent models implemented in Sudbury and North Bay. In areas which Schabas correctly identified as being in need of professional development, local apathy quickly terminated any initiative for a successful and ongoing resident musician program.

3.13.2. DISCUSSION

In our discussions with orchestra managers and music directors, particularly in the more remote northern communities, it became apparent that, while there was recognition that the resident musician concept was valid, the general perception was that past failures resulted from the following factors:

1. A lack of input from the local community in planning the program;

2. A lack of commitment on the part of those professional musicians chosen for the program;

3. A lack of training for the particular demands placed on a resident musician;

4. A general artistic isolation felt by the individual resident musician;

5. A lack of professional expertise in monitoring the development of the resident musician and the program itself.

The most recent program developed by the O.A.C. in Sudbury and North Bay has addressed many of these problems, but much more could be accomplished, particularly in the training and selection process for prospective resident musicians and with respect to the problem of artistic isolation. The former could be improved by assisting in the development of training programs which focus specifically on the special skills

required of a resident musician, in addition to performance skills. Training would place teaching and community development capabilities at least on a par with performance competence. The training would develop in the potential resident musician, a perception of the high degree of personal self-worth which can be achieved as a result of being a musical "leader" in a small community. The resident musician must be prepared to become a member of that community in all senses rather than a "carpet-bagger" musician. The problem of artistic isolation could be dealt with, at least in part, by ensuring that young resident musicians be employed, wherever possible, as duos, trios or quartets.

3.13.3. RECOMMENDATION

That a Resident Musician Program receive high priority, providing that its requirements are carefully articulated and providing that it is monitored on a regular basis. If at all possible, consideration should be given to sending out a minimum of 2 professionals for any residency site.

3.13.4. FUNDING

On a funding program which includes contributions from the community and from the O.A.C., as well as potential earned revenue, it is estimated that each resident musician will require O.A.C. funding of approximately $26,000 over a three-year period (year 1: $12,000; year 2: $8,000; year 3: $6,000). The following communities, all of which do not have easy access to a pool of professional musicians, could benefit immeasurably from the experience of the well-planned programs which are already functioning in Sudbury and North Bay.

COMMUNITY	NO. YR1	FUND YR1	NO. YR2	FUND YR2	NO. YR3	FUND YR3
Huronia	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
Georgian Bay	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
Sarnia	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
North Bay	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
Peterborough	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
Sault S. Marie	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
Sudbury	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
Timmins	2	24,000	3	28,000	4	32,000
TOTAL	16	193,000	24	224,000	32	256,000

Funding for each resident musician is calculated as follows:

. year 1: 12,000
. year 2: 8,000
. year 3: 6,000

At the end of five years, total funding costs for the O.A.C. will be 32 X $6,000 = $192,000. This is a relatively modest investment considering the potential musical and teaching gains for the participating communities.

3.13.5. TIME LINE

A Resident Musician Program has already begun in Sudbury and North Bay. With the modifications outlined, it can easily be extended into any of the suggested communities within the next year, providing new money to fund the program is made available and effective guidelines have been established.

SECTION 4

4. FUNDING FOR ORCHESTRAS 2001

In this section of the report, we will be recommending substantial changes in the orchestra support policy of the Ontario Arts Council. These changes are designed to encourage responsibility and innovation, recognize achievement, and stimulate local initiative and pride. The orchestral "map" of Ontario is vastly different today than it was in 1963 and, while much of the wealth of orchestral activity in Ontario can be attributed to the forward-looking ideas of Ezra Schabas in 1966, many of these ideas are no longer relevant to the communities and orchestras of today. In particular, changing funding priorities at all levels of government require different and flexible funding support mechanisms from the private sector, from earned revenue potential, as well as from government, if the next 20 years is to be as culturally productive as the last.

In order to form a clear understanding of the effectiveness of current funding for orchestras, we have added to our thorough examination of orchestras a comprehensive financial examination of all O.A.C. funded orchestras from the 1983-84 season to the present, including plans for the 1988-89 season. Most of the financial data has been extracted from grant submissions, and a word of caution is necessary in considering this data used for this report. In many cases, we found inaccuracies in figures used in grant applications, sometimes as a result of inadequate professional preparation and sometimes as a result of misplaced enthusiasm for future prospects. However, the statistics do convey a fair and reasonable analysis of the past 5 years.

4.1. CBR: COMMUNITY BASED REVENUE

4.1.1. PROBLEM

Recognition of the importance of access to the arts as an important component of community development is not a new concept; it has been the subject of innumerable artistic debates, seminars, etc. and is, in fact, now a major consideration in decisions concerning economic development. What has emerged very recently is a heightened awareness of the importance of local involvement in decisions, of local responsibility for these decisions and local participation in the artistic development process. Community residents are no longer content to be cultural consumers of an ephemeral

attraction; transient and imposed concepts of artistic excellence are far less important than the growth of an artistic enterprise as an integral and permanent part of the community.

With the growth in community initiatives and identification, has come an awareness of the responsibility for local support. For funding purposes, it is essential that a proper measure of that support be established, an equitable measure that is clear and easily understood by all organizations applying for Council support.

4.1.2. DISCUSSION

An equation frequently used by arts organizations is a comparison of grant levels and grant increases to expense budgets. This equation may have a certain validity as a lobbying tool, but it is completely irrelevant in measuring the level of community support as a determining factor in grant funding. A budget includes earned revenue, private sector revenue and local government funding support, all of which are indications of the level of community interest and support. However, the budget may also include funding from other levels of government and government agencies, touring assistance from other sources and built-in deficit financing, none of which are a measure of community support.

Considered individually, each of the components of Community Based Revenue - earned revenue, private revenue and local government revenue - is not a satisfactory measure of community support because of variations from community to community and from year to year. From 1983-84 to 1987-88, total earned revenues of orchestras reporting to the O.A.C. increased from $3,032,882 to $4,872,672, but decreased as a percentage of expenses from 38.12% to 36.11%. In the same period, private revenues rose from $1,935,856 to $3,421,113 and increased as a percentage of expenses from 24.33 to 25.35. Local grants, including municipal and regional councils, rose from $685,526 to $1,330,005 and increased as a percentage of expenses from 8.62 to 9.86. Taken together as Community Based Revenue, the increase was from $5,654,264 to $9,673,790 and this represents a fairly stable percentage of expenses, 71.06 in 1983-84 to 71.31 in 1987-88. Arts Council funding for orchestras, in comparison to Community Based Revenue, fell from 21.95% in 1983-84 to 18.97% in 1987-88, but this is considerably more than the 13.53% of expense budgets, and more accurately reflects the response of the O.A.C. to community support.

Community Based Revenue is also a critical factor when considering the chronic problem of annual deficits. The reporting of accumulated deficits may be somewhat misleading due to the temporary infusion of emergency deficit reduction funds, but annual deficits reflect the failure of some components of the orchestra's operation to meet planned budgeted expectations. It is interesting to note that, of the 46 instances where orchestras reported deficits in excess of 3% between 1983 – 84 and 1987 – 88, 38 reported that expenses increased at a faster rate than Community Based Revenue, and there were actually 24 cases where Community Based Revenue decreased from the previous year. O.A.C. grants increased in all but 2 of the 46 cases of deficits.

4.1.3. RECOMMENDATION

That Community Based Revenue, derived from a combination of earned revenue, private sector revenue and local government revenue, be used as the principal measure of community support for orchestras in Ontario.

4.1.4. FUNDING

There are no additional financial implications for the O.A.C.

4.1.5. TIME LINE

Community Based Funding is a concept which can be implemented immediately following explanation of the program to the orchestra clients of the O.A.C.

4.2. NCBF: NEW CYCLE BASE FUNDING

4.2.1. PROBLEM

The orchestras included in the mandate of this study have been described as Professional Orchestras and Community Orchestras for purposes of funding by the Ontario Arts Council. Within each category, all orchestras have been assessed for funding through a set of guidelines which, although not understood by all, have at least attempted to define equitable standards and equitable treatment for assessment. However, this equitability has not extended between "community" and "professional", for reasons stated elsewhere in this report, with the result that funding has been disproportionately large in some cases and disproportionately small in others. While there have been rational explanations for these disparities, it is our belief that the time has come for all orchestras to be given the opportunity to participate in the assessment process, much more than they have in the past, and that

a starting point should be the present level of funding, with an equal opportunity to progress through operation and project funding, on their own merits and through their own mandate, whether "community" or "professional".

4.2.2. DISCUSSION

As stated in 4.1., grant revenue as a percentage of expense budget is not a valid statistic, neither for the Ontario Arts Council nor for those orchestras which are fiscally responsible. Of the 10 community orchestras reporting deficits in excess of 3% of the expense budget in 1987 – 88, 5 increased their expense budget for 1988 – 89 in excess of 3%, 1 by as much as 39.64%, and 4 increased their proposed expenses in excess of the rate of increase the previous year Their rate of increase in Community Based Revenue was an average of 2.89% in 1987 – 88, and an average of 12.2% for the 4 years 1984 – 85 to 1987 – 88. Yet the 10 orchestras are proposing an average increase in Community Based Revenue of 19.5% in 1988 – 89, a revenue projection the achievement of which will be highly unlikely.

The same problem exists with their O.A.C. grant projections. The average grant increase for the 10 community orchestras was 6.67% in 1987 – 88, and they are proposing an average increase of 42.8% in 1988 – 89. Some professional orchestras also include unrealistic grant applications. The average grant increase to professional orchestras was 4.78% in 1987 – 88; 3 orchestras requested increases of 220%, 100% and 76.47% respectively, none of which had any previous experience which would support such expectations.

This kind of reporting in grant applications not only indicates less than careful planning on the part of the orchestras, but also creates problems for the Council when assessing financial responsibility as an essential component in awarding operating grants. Recognizing that part of the problem may be insecurity on the part of the orchestras in not having any assurance that grants will be continued from year to year, we believe that a new and effective approach to funding could include the establishment of a virtually guaranteed base level of funding for 3 years, with the provision for modest increases through a recognition of achievement and larger increases in project grants as a result of innovation and initiatives.

4.2.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the present level of operating grant funding for all orchestras within the mandate of this study be established as a starting point for future development, hereafter referred to as New Cycle Base Funding or NCBF.

4.2.4. FUNDING

Funding for this recommendation is outlined in the following recommendations.

4.2.5. TIME LINE

New Cycle Base Funding can be implemented immediately, with the grants awarded for 1988 – 89 designated as the NCBF.

4.3. GUARANTEED MINIMUM FUNDING & ACHIEVEMENT GRANTS

4.3.1. PROBLEM

O.A.C. funding for Ontario orchestras is currently distributed as operating grants, following an annual assessment of performance in the 4 principal areas of community service, community support, financial and administrative responsibility and artistic achievement. Problems for orchestras exist, as mentioned earlier, in the lack of any secured funding for more than 1 year and inadequate funding for justifiable expansion and initiative. The problem for the Council arises from a lack of flexibility and a resulting inability to respond adequately to successful growth and initiative. The Council has also found it very difficult to effectively deal with orchestras which are not meeting their objectives. Funding to the Council from the Ministry has been barely adequate to maintain on – going operating funding for orchestras and there is very little available for project funding of any description.

4.3.2. DISCUSSION

Before entering into a discussion of the mechanism of New Cycle Base Funding, we would like to stress that this is not intended as an alternative to the pressing need for higher funding levels from the Ministry to the O.A.C. Indeed, it will be impossible for the Council to effectively support the growing demand for orchestral activity in all parts of the province unless it does receive a substantial increase in the present level of funding available for orchestras.

The intent of the NCBF proposal is to take the present level of funding and, by setting new parameters and guidelines for the awarding of grants, create more

stability for the orchestras, provide an opportunity to respond to initiatives and reduce the possibility of inequitable treatment.

In order to provide the flexibility needed by the Council, it is suggested that three-year funding guarantees to the orchestras be set at 90% of the NCBF. For example, an orchestra currently receiving $100,000 in funding from the Council, will be virtually guaranteed a minimum grant of $90,000 for each of the next 3 years. In addition, an orchestra may receive achievement grants up to 12% of NCBF in year 1, 14% of NCBF in year 2 and 16% of NCBF in year 3. The criteria for these achievement grants are set forth in 4.4.

The following table indicates the effect that this proposal for NCBF funding would have had, if it had been implemented in 1984-85, and using the level of grants awarded for each of the years from 1984-85 to 1987-88:

Total Grants To Orchestras:
- 1984-85 = 1,369,700
- 1987-88 = 1,825,300

THEORETICAL NCBF THREE YEAR CYCLE
1984-87

1984-85	1985-86		1986-87		1987-88	
NCBF	MIN	MAX	MIN	MAX	MIN	MAX
	90%	102%	90%	104%	90%	106%
1369700	1232730	1397094	1232730	1424488	1232730	1451882

The actual grants that the O.A.C. distributed to orchestras in this three-year period were as follows:

1985-86: 1,612,290
1986-87: 1,723,721
1987-88: 1,825,300

Assuming that all orchestras were awarded the maximum in guaranteed grant funding and achievement grants, the Council would still have been able to respond to growth and initiatives to the following extent:

1985-86: 1,612,290 - 1,397,094 = 215,196
1986-87: 1,723,721 - 1,424,488 = 299,233
1987-88: 1,825,300 - 1,451,882 = 373,418

In other words, funds for operating and project grants would have been distributed as follows:

	1985 – 86	1986 – 87	1987 – 88
Operating	86.7%	82.6%	79.5%
Project	1.3%	17.4%	20.5%

Of course, any funds that were not distributed in achievement grants would increase the amount available to the O.A.C. for project funding.

It must be emphasized here that the 102%, 104% and 106% ceilings are not intended in any way as a maximum assistance in any year for any orchestra. There is no limit on the amount available in project funding, but such funds are one – time grants and may only be renewed if the project has been successfully completed and it can be demonstrated that a renewal is justified.

What this proposal can accomplish is the provision of flexibility to the Council, enabling it to respond to positive initiative and successful achievement, while at the same time providing orchestras which are not meeting their objectives, with an incentive for improved performance.

4.3.3. RECOMMENDATION

That, starting with the year of implementation of this proposal, and providing that the criteria set forth in 4.4 are met, each presently funded orchestra will be guaranteed 90% of the NCBF for each year, for a period of 3 years. The NCBF will be initially set at the level of operating funding for each orchestra in the year of implementation. Further, each orchestra, providing that it meets criteria set forth in 4.5, will be eligible for an additional achievement grant as follows:

Year 1: up to 12% of NCBF
Year 2: up to 14% of NCBF
Year 3: up to 16% of NCBF

4.3.4. FUNDING

No additional funding will be required, but the present level of funding to each orchestra will be adjusted according to the NCBF formula.

4.3.5. TIME LINE

The new NCBF formula for funding can be implemented following the awarding of grants for 1988 – 89.

4.4. GUARANTEED FUNDING AND RESPONSIBILITY

4.4.1. PROBLEM

Although the intent of NCBF is to provide each orchestra with the security of guaranteed funding over a three-year period, it would be irresponsible for any government agency to deny itself the possibility of responding to fiscal irresponsibility on the part of any of its clients.

4.4.2. DISCUSSION

Included in the 4 basic documents required from each orchestra (mission statement, artistic policy, plans for the current year and long term plan), and in each orchestra's contractual agreement with the O.A.C. to meet certain objectives in return for funding, should be a clear statement committing the orchestra's Board of Directors to the responsibility of maintaining reasonable fiscal and administrative standards. The board must also agree to maintain the non-profit status of the orchestra and to complete each season of concerts and other activity as outlined in the plan for the current year. Each of these three basic components - administrative and fiscal responsibility, non-profit status and completion of the season - should be considered a basic minimum requirement from each orchestra in order to retain eligibility for guaranteed minimum funding.

4.4.3. RECOMMENDATION

To be eligible for 90% guaranteed funding over the three-year cycle of NCBF, each orchestra must continue to meet generally accepted standards of administrative and fiscal responsibility, must maintain its status as a non-profit society and must complete its season as proposed in its one-year operating plan and budget. Each orchestra's board of directors must be formally committed to its basic requirements for funding support.

4.4.4. FUNDING

No funding is required to implement this recommendation.

4.4.5. TIME LINE

This recommendation must be implemented concurrently with the establishment of New Cycle Base Funding.

4.5. ACCOUNTABILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT GRANTS

4.5.1. PROBLEM

Except in rare circumstances, the Council has not been able to deal effectively with orchestras which do not meet minimum standards of acceptability in one or more of the four basic areas of accountability; community support, community service, administrative and fiscal responsibility and artistic achievement. Nor has the Council had funds available to respond positively to orchestras whose performance in these areas has been exemplary. In other words, the Council has lacked the flexibility to deal effectively with poor performance, as well as excellent performance.

4.5.2. DISCUSSION

During the four seasons, 1984 – 85 to 1987 – 88, there were 46 instances where orchestras reported annual deficits in excess of 3% of expense budgets. These ranged from 3.14% to 33.99%. In only 4 of these cases was O.A.C. funding actually reduced, and 33 of the orchestras reporting deficits had grant increases ranging between .05% and 116.66%. Nine orchestras had their grants maintained at the same level as the previous year. Twenty – five of the forty – six deficit reporting orchestras also reported a decline in Community Based Revenue.

Of the 7 community orchestras reporting deficits in excess of 3% of expenses in 1986 – 87, only 1 showed an increase in Community Based Revenue, and there was an overall decline in CBR of 4.36%. All 7 orchestras produced expense budget increases ranging from 3.28% to 27.35%, with a combined total expense increase, over the previous year, of 15.07%. Three of the four professional orchestras reporting deficits in 1986 – 87 also indicated increases in Community Based Revenue, but the combined total increase of 23.18% was far exceeded by the increase in expenses of 47.66%. Combined total of grants to these orchestras was increased by 6.82% for the following year.

By contrast, the 7 community orchestras reporting a profit or balanced budget in the same year, reported combined CBR increases of 36.68%, with only 1 orchestra showing a very small decrease of 1.11%. The combined increase in expense budgets came to only 10.17%, with 2 orchestras actually reporting a decrease. The 7 professional orchestras indicating balanced budgets or profits for the same year, reported a combined CBR increase of 19.89%, and a combined expense increase of 11.18%. Grants for all orchestras reporting balanced budgets or profits increased by 6.34%.

COMMUNITY ORCHESTRAS

	Deficits (7)	Bal. Budget (7)
Expense increase: 85 – 86 to 86 – 87	15.07%	10.17%
CBR increase: 85 – 86 to 86 – 87	(4.36%)	36.68%
Grant increase: 86 – 87 to 87 – 88	5.19%	26.82%

PROFESSIONAL ORCHESTRAS

	Deficits (4)	Bal. Budget (7)
Expense increase: 85 – 86 to 86 – 87	47.66%	11.18%
CBR increase: 85 – 86 to 86 – 87	23.18%	19.89%
Grant increase: 86 – 87 to 87 – 88	7.07%	5.06%

The increase in grants for all orchestras in 1987 – 88 amounted to $101,579, or 5.89% over 1986 – 87. The increase for all orchestras, community and professional, with deficits and a poor CBR record amounted to 6.82% and for all orchestras with balanced budgets and a favourable CBR record, to 6.34%. With the limited funds available and the expectation to retain grants, at least at the level of the previous year, the Council has very little flexibility to respond appropriately to differing performance achievements on the part of individual orchestra. New Cycle Base Funding, with the added flexibility of achievement grants amounting to 12%, 14% and 16% for each year of the three – year cycle, will enable the Council to respond much more effectively to positive achievement, and to encourage orchestras to meet the agreed upon guidelines. It will also reduce unrealistic expectations on the part of the orchestras and establish clearly identifiable funding parameters.

4.5.3. RECOMMENDATION

That, to receive additional achievement grants of up to 12%, 14% and 16% over the three-year period, the orchestra must demonstrate its degree of success in meeting the objectives outlined in its one-year operating plan and its adherence to policies outlined in its mission and artistic policy statements. There should also be an assessment by the O.A.C. of the orchestra's success in meeting agreed upon guidelines for community support, community service, administrative and fiscal responsibility and artistic achievement.

4.6. NEW CYCLE BASE FUNDING AND PROJECT FUNDING

4.6.1. PROBLEM

The proposal for NCBF would be quite unworkable if orchestras continue to submit applications for increases in operating funding which are in excess of the limits set forth in the three-year cycle. At the same time, it should be absolutely clear that the intent of this proposal is not to limit the capacity of an orchestra to expand in an orderly and creative manner. The orchestra should be encouraged to use whatever resources are available to develop new initiatives, to improve the quality of the orchestra and to utilize opportunities for growth.

4.6.2. DISCUSSION

Grant requests for the 1988-89 season total $2,190,322, or an increase of 20% over the grant total of $1,825,300 for 1987-88. The requested increases range up to 220% and in many cases come as a result of the incorporation of touring and project funding into operating funds.

As previously stated, there should be no attempt to limit the ability of an orchestra to seek funding for new projects, expanded seasons, touring, improvements to contracts, etc. However, none of the funding for these kinds of initiatives should be included in NCBF and ongoing operating funding, until it has been well-established that the orchestra will be able to sustain the initiatives on a continuing basis. Any requests for funding which are in excess of the parameters outlined for guaranteed minimum funding and achievement grants under the NCBF proposal, should be submitted as project grants and reviewed each year.

4.6.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C. not accept grant applications which include requests for granting assistance which are in excess of NCBF guidelines: all requests for grant assistance in excess of these guidelines must be directed to the O.A.C. through project grant applications.

4.6.4. FUNDING

No additional funding is required to implement this recommendation.

4.6.5. TIME LINE

This recommendation should be implemented concurrently with New Cycle Base Funding, and each orchestra must receive notification at least three months prior to grant application deadlines.

4.7. ADJUSTED NEW CYCLE BASE FUNDING

4.7.1. PROBLEM

The NCBF level will be set at the beginning of a three-year cycle, and be unchanged for the duration of that cycle. Also unchanged will be the 90% minimum guaranteed funding. The additional achievement grant will fluctuate from year to year, depending on an assessment of the orchestra's degree of success in meeting its commitments. However, it would be unreasonable to expect orchestras, especially those which are operating successfully, to continue to receive funding at the same NCBF level for more than 3 years.

4.7.2. DISCUSSION

Inflationary pressure and normal growth demands would severely inhibit the orchestra's capacity to serve its constituency, if the base level of funding remains the same for more than 3 years.

An adjustment at the end of each three-year cycle would provide the O.A.C. with the flexibility to raise the level of guaranteed grants for successful orchestras, but it would also place the responsibility for improving performance standards on those orchestras which have fallen below the maximum allowable level of achievement grants during the three-year cycle. At the end of the cycle, a successful orchestra could have its new NCBF set at 106% of the former level, plus a possible transfer of project grant funding to an even higher NCBF; an unsuccessful orchestra could have its NCBF dropped to as low as 90% of the former NCBF level. As with all the recommendations in this section, the effect would be to reward successful achievement, to encourage improvement

when it is needed, to provide reasonable funding guarantees for the orchestras and to provide the Council with the flexibility to respond effectively to the fluctuations and changing patterns which are inevitable in Ontario's orchestral community.

4.7.3. RECOMMENDATION

That, at the end of every three-year cycle, the NCBF be adjusted either up or down by taking 90% of the NCBF and adding the achievement grant level in year 3, or an average of the 3 years, whichever is higher.

4.7.3.1. EXAMPLE 1: 100,000 NCBF

Achievement grant in year 1: 7,000 (maximum = 12,000)
Achievement grant in year 2: 8,000 (maximum = 14,000)
Achievement grant in year 3: 6,000 (maximum = 16,000)

Average of 3 years of achievement grants is 7,000
Adjusted NCBF is 90,000 + 7,000 = 97,000
New Guaranteed grant: next three-year cycle = 87,300.

4.7.3.2. EXAMPLE 2: 100,000 NCBF

Achievement grant in year 1: 12,000
Achievement grant in year 2: 14,000
Achievement grant in year 3: 16,000

Average of 3 years of achievement grants is 14,000
Adjusted NCBF is 90,000 + 16,000 (grant year 3) = 106,000
New Guaranteed Grant: next three-year cycle = 95,400

4.8. PROJECT FUNDING TO OPERATING FUNDING

4.8.1. PROBLEM

In 4.3.2., we established that the minimum available project funding in the years 1985-86, 1986-87 and 1987-88 would have been 13.7%, 17.7% and 20.8% respectively, using the actual level of O.A.C. orchestra funding in 1984-85 as the NCBF, and calculating the difference between the maximum allowable under the NCBF guidelines and the amount actually awarded for each year. Assuming that the same level of funding will remain for the next 3 years, a similar percentage will be available for project funding for each of the orchestras currently receiving funding. In order to retain current reasonable rates of increases, many of the orchestras' activities will, of necessity, come under project funding, with no guarantees of renewal.

4.8.2. DISCUSSION

In a sense, it may be argued that all artistic activities of an orchestra are innovative. Except in the case of repeats, no two concerts are the same; audiences differ in size and response, there are constantly changing venues, repertoire varies and guest artists are seldom the same from year to year and concert to concert. From an administrative point of view, there is the constant search for innovative ways to increase earned revenue, enlarge audiences and develop a larger base of private support. Therefore, there should be no difficulty in separating areas of an orchestra's activities which are clearly identifiable as innovative, requiring initiative, and which have a reasonable expectation of success. There are risks involved in developing project funding proposals, but the rewards to the orchestra can include, not only the success of the activity funded, but also the prospect of future guaranteed operating funding, if the project continues to be successful.

Project funding gives the O.A.C. the flexibility to assist in well-planned and carefully executed projects, without a commitment, implied or otherwise, for further funding. It also provides the Council with a much higher percentage of available funds to direct to worthwhile projects.

Nevertheless, it is reasonable for an orchestra to expect that, given a record of success over a three-year period, these funds can be transferred to NCBF guaranteed funding, thereby establishing a new, higher base level and the possibility for moving on to other proposals for project funding. Project funding categories are outlined in sections 3.11., 3.12. and 3.13., the Innovation/Risk Program, the professional assistance for remote communities and the Resident Musician Program.

4.8.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the three-year adjusted NCBF also include the transfer of project funds to operating funds, providing that a project funded program has been successfully sustained for a three-year period and that all other operating grant conditions have been met.

PROJECT FUND PROPOSAL

Resident Musician Program (RMP)
Year 1: 12,000
Year 2: 8,000
Year 3: 6,000

Example 1 (4.7.3.1.)
NCBF = 100,000
Adjusted NCBF = 97,000
Transfer of RMP project funds to operating = 6,000
New NCBF = 103,000
New Guaranteed Grant = 92,700

EXAMPLE 2 (4.7.3.2)
NCBF--= 100,000
Adjusted NCBF = 106,000
Transfer of RMP project funds to operating = 6,000
New NCBF = 112,000
New Guaranteed Grant = 100,800

4.8.4. FUNDING

No additional funding will be required for this recommendation during the first three-year cycle. At the beginning of the second three-year cycle additional funds required will depend on the amount transferred from project to operating grants for the new NCBF level.

4.8.5. TIME LINE

This recommendation will take effect at the conclusion of the first three-year cycle.

4.9. RESOURCE POOL

4.9.1. PROBLEM

The preceding recommendations in section 4 are primarily concerned with operating and project funding for existing orchestras, and deal with guaranteed funding, funding for achievement within clearly established objectives and guidelines, and funding for projects which generally occur as a normal part of an orchestra's activities, and for which there is a limited risk factor. What is not covered under the NCBF program is the type of extremely important, but largely speculative program, described in section 3.11 as an Innovation/Risk Program, and the New Orchestra Program described in section 3.10. The changes in funding which have been recommended are designed for existing orchestras, but are not sufficient to meet the requirements outlined in sections 3.10 and 3.11.

4.9.2. DISCUSSION

It is clearly impossible for the O.A.C. to respond effectively to legitimate requests for new orchestra funding and to genuine proposals for Innovation/Risk Programs within the parameters of its current funding from the Ministry, without unfairly jeopardizing existing clients. Within the past 5 years we could only identify 4 orchestras which have been added to the funded list, and there are at least 12 more waiting to be considered for funding.

All such requests should be considered on the same level as requests for funding in other programs and should not be the subject of pressure from any external source, or the result of well-placed lobbying. Therefore, a stable and sufficient pool of money should be established for the sole purpose of funding the Innovation/Risk Program and the new Orchestra Program, and the funds should be clearly earmarked for this purpose.

4.9.3. RECOMMENDATION

That a Resource Pool be established to finance the two new programs: the Innovation/Risk Program and the New Orchestra Program.

4.9.4. FUNDING

In the first year of implementation, the Resource Pool will require $200,000. Further funding will then be required to maintain the fund at the level of $200,000 for the first 3 years, at the end of which time, the amount required will be re-assessed.

4.9.5. TIME LINE

This recommendation should be implemented immediately, and applications for assistance should be received for the 1989-90 season.

4.10. AN EXPANDED O.A.C. SERVICE CAPABILITY

4.10.1. PROBLEM

In 1984-85, the O.A.C. funded 31 orchestras in Ontario, exclusive of the Toronto Symphony, and distributed grants totalling $1,369,700. In 1987-88, the Council funded 35 orchestras, exclusive of the Toronto Symphony, and distributed grants totalling $1,825,300 to these orchestras. The Music Office of the Council is also responsible for many other programs, including chamber music, opera, professional training, festivals, etc., all of which are increasing in scope and complexity. To handle this enormous volume of work, the Council has depended

on virtually the same number of staff in the Music Office as have been in place for the past few years.

4.10.2. DISCUSSION

To the credit of the Music Officers, we experienced a very positive attitude toward the Council everywhere in Ontario. In communities distant from Toronto, we frequently met requests for even more direct contact with the officers, and more of what has been described as the "most welcome and encouraging visits" from the officers.

We were interested in the observation made in the 1980 OFSO Task Force Report on Recommendations for the Future, that orchestras were encouraged to expand by means of O.A.C. grants. In our questionnaire to orchestra boards and administrators, we questioned whether or not this was their perception and the result was virtually a unanimous "no". The expansion has come from within each community and the continually growing number of orchestras in Ontario, plus the very evident support for these orchestras in terms of audience response and Community Based Funding, is an indication of how very important orchestral activity has become to virtually every community in the province.

In addition to the normal processing of grant applications, communities require, and expect, guidance from the Council, either directly or in programs and projects administered by the Council. As effective as the Music Office has been up to the present time, we believe that it will be impossible to maintain the very positive image which currently exists, without additional staff.

We, of course, also accept responsibility for further compounding the problem by recommending funding initiatives which will require even more time from the Music Office!

4.10.3. RECOMMENDATION

That, given the size of a large and growing orchestral community, the increased demands on the professional services of the music section officers which will result from the implementation of the recommendations in this report and the current need for more direct field contact between the O.A.C. and each individual orchestra, there be an increase in music section staff of at least two full-time professionals to handle the new support, development and assessment procedures.

4.10.4. FUNDING

Funds will be required to employ two additional full-time professionals in the Music Office. These funds should be in addition to those funds required to implement the other recommendations in this report.

4.10.5. TIME LINE

One additional staff professional be added immediately to the Music Office; the second should be added one year following the implementation of the recommendations of this report.

4.11. FINANCIAL STABILIZATION FUND

4.11.1. PROBLEM

There has been extensive coverage of the financial crises which has plagued orchestras all over North America during the past season. Ontario has not been without its orchestra crisis situations, but there has not been the total collapse of any orchestra suffering from an overwhelming financial burden, such as happened in Vancouver.

We have suggested changes in funding mechanisms which, hopefully, will help to prevent such crises from developing. Nevertheless, the history of orchestras would seem to indicate that deficit situations will almost inevitably develop from time to time, in a cultural environment where so much depends on a number of unpredictable variables.

4.11.2. DISCUSSION

In 1979, Franz Kraemer noted that all 15 Canadian orchestras funded by the Canada Council were in accumulated deficit situations and recommended that Canada Council funding should be withdrawn from all orchestras whose accumulated deficits reached 30% of their total budget.[1] Even this dire threat did not prevent the recurring cycle of growing deficits, threatened bankruptcy, intensive lobbying, emergency bail-out funding and, once again, recurring deficits, threatened bankruptcy, etc., etc., etc.

However, the bail-out solution, which seems to have been at least temporarily successful in Ontario, creates its own problems. Orchestras which feel that financial responsibility goes unrewarded are tempted to

---

[1] Kraemer, Franz. The State of Canadian Orchestras, paper presented to the Canada Council, December 10, 1979, p.3.

deliberately initiate expansionist policies which will inevitably lead to large deficits, on the assumption that they too will receive bail – out funds. Temporary funding solutions to recurring financial crises all too frequently lead to insupportable levels of activity and unrealistic expectations, which in turn lead to further difficulty. At the very least, it creates animosity in the Ontario community of orchestras, between those which have received bail – out funding and those which have not.

On the other hand, there is unanimous agreement within the orchestra community that every reasonable effort should be made to assist orchestras in difficulty, and prevent total collapse. The Council has a long – standing – and correct – policy that it cannot be involved in deficit support programs. It does not have the resources for this, and to do so would remove the responsibility from where it rightfully belongs – in the communities which have developed the problems. Earlier in this report, we noted the parallel between deficits and a decline in Community Based Revenue. What is required is a stabilization fund which will provide temporary assistance and at the same time enable the communities to improve their local support programs. The orchestras receiving assistance from this fund must include in their current obligations a statement of responsibility for the temporary assistance received, and a record of the manner in which they deal with this obligation will become part of the assessment for achievement grants. It is not appropriate that the O.A.C. handle these stabilization funds directly, but it should be involved in an advisory capacity.

4.11.3. RECOMMENDATION

That in order to deal with financial crises, the O.A.C. recommend to the Ministry of Citizenship & Culture that it establish a Financial Stabilization Fund to which an orchestra in difficulty can turn for help. Determination of the extent of the crisis will be by an appointed advisory committee from the orchestral community. Funds will then be made available, within a contractual commitment between the orchestra and the Ministry, for a low interest loan and a five – year loan repayment and deficit reduction program.

4.12. PRIORITIES

4.12.1. PROBLEM

Many of the recommendations beyond the NCBF guidelines will require funding levels which, realistically, may not all be immediately attainable. However, there

are certain problems which must be addressed immediately and which will require some additional funding.

4.12.2. DISCUSSION

In our report, we have identified three principal areas where additional funding will be required. These are:

1. To increase O.A.C. support services in order to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations of this report, maintain and improve contact between the Council and its present clients and to effectively administer the vastly increased volume of funding administration;

2. To provide immediate, and in some cases large, operating grant increases in order to correct present "historically developed" anomalies in orchestra funding; and

3. To establish a level of project grant funding, in addition to that available as a result of the NCBF program, for new orchestras, innovation/risk, audience development, etc.

As a result of our interviews throughout the province and a thorough examination of the vast quantities of material available for this report, we are convinced that the priorities should be established as set forth above. Nothing much can be accomplished without sufficient support staff; historical anomalies must be addressed in order to reduce undesirable tensions within the orchestra community and the projects can be developed as funds become available.

4.12.3. RECOMMENDATION

That any increase in funding for orchestras beyond the NCBF guidelines be priorized as follows: O.A.C. support services recommended in this report; operating grant increases to address present "historical" anomalies; and, project grants (new orchestras, innovation/risk, audience development, etc).

4.12.4. FUNDING

Funding required to implement the priorities established in this recommendation has been identified in other sections of this report.

4.12.5. TIME LINE

Other than the recommendations to increase O.A.C. support staff, the recommended implementation time of

the priorized items will depend on the availability of funds. However, it should be stressed that some of the suggestions, such as addressing "historical" anomalies and new orchestra funding, need almost immediate attention.

4.13. ACCURATE GRANT INFORMATION

4.13.1. PROBLEM

In our analysis of O.A.C. grant applications, we were continually having to deal with incomplete and inaccurate information. Some of this was the result of careless, ill-informed processing, but in other cases there was an obvious effort to mislead and in some instances to withhold information.

4.13.2. DISCUSSION

Inaccurate and incomplete information was a problem for us in attempting to establish reliable statistics. However, it is a much greater problem for the Music Officers when the time comes to review the grant applications and make recommendations largely based on the information provided in the application, when that information is inaccurate and misleading.

We are aware of the contention that salaries and fees are a private concern and should not be made available. We are in agreement with this, if the business or organization is entirely private and is not seeking public funds. However, in the case of orchestras seeking public funding, we believe that it is very much the concern of the granting agency to see that the public funds are not being used indiscriminately for personal gain. To the credit of most orchestras, this information has been made available to the Council, and to the credit of the Council, it has been kept confidential.

4.13.3. RECOMMENDATION

That funding be withheld from orchestras which deliberately withhold information, or provide misleading information, on grant applications.

4.13.4. FUNDING

No funding is required to implement this recommendation.

4.13.5. TIME LINE

This recommendation should be implemented immediately.

SECTION 5

5. INTERACTION: THE ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL, THE CANADIAN MUSIC CENTRE & THE ONTARIO FEDERATION OF SYMPHONY ORCHESTRAS

5.1. CANADIAN REPERTOIRE: A C.M.C. FIELD SERVICE

5.1.1. PROBLEM

The Canadian Music Centre provides a superb resource for the development of our own Canadian music. Thousands of scores and parts are available for performance. Unfortunately, in spite of the excellent services available from the Canadian Music Centre, accessibility for most Ontario conductors, in terms of having the time to spend in Toronto choosing appropriate repertoire, limits its performance potential.

5.1.2. DISCUSSION

Over and over again, conductors expressed interest in having direct access to professional assistance and information from the Canadian Music Centre; not in Toronto where in the space of a few hours they must try and assess a multitude of scores, but on home ground, drawing on the expertise of the Canadian Music Centre staff in relation to their orchestra's specific needs. Even when scores are sent out on consignment from the directories currently available, there is still a huge gap between the existing resource and its effective utilization.

With more than 50 orchestras in Ontario, the potential for audiences to become conversant with the existence and the vitality of music composed by their own composers, is exciting. But for this to happen, the Canadian Music Centre needs to get out to the orchestras, "on their own turf".

The Canadian Music Centre is currently planning for the establishment of regional marketing committees for the Canadian Music Centre throughout the province. This would certainly be a step towards addressing the problem, but even with implementation of this project direct contact of Canadian Music Centre professionals with the orchestras is central to an increase in the performance of Canadian repertoire.

5.1.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C., in consultation with the Canadian Music Centre, develop a proposal for the establishment of a Field Service Program to increase accessibility to existing Canadian repertoire. Assessment of the effectiveness of this program should take place following completion of the first three – year cycle.

5.1.4. FUNDING

As a first stage in the development of this service, 50 working days, or approximately 20% of the Ontario regional director's salary, would be required. Travel expenses would double this amount. Joint funding by the Ontario Arts Council and the Canadian Music Centre is recommended. If shared on a matching dollar basis, cost to the O.A.C. would be in the vicinity of $8,000 per year.

5.1.5. TIME LINE

Discussions with the Canadian Music Centre should start immediately and the program should be ready for implementation during the 1988 – 89 season.

5.2. CANADIAN REPERTOIRE: A "SAMPLER" APPROACH

5.2.1. PROBLEM

Although the situation is slowly improving, thanks to the efforts of Centrediscs and the C.B.C., a relatively small portion of the extensive Canadian repertoire is available on recordings. The Canadian Music Centre holds an extensive tape library of live performances, but these have a library – use – only limitation.

5.2.2. DISCUSSION

Any conductor who has heard the Canadian Music Centre's two – tape **Seagram Orchestral Repertoire Sampler** of Canadian composers, found it a most useful tool. A five minute excerpt can provide a conductor with a quick overview of style, technical difficulty and instrumentation. This concept is one which merits further exploration and development, particularly if co – ordinated with a field service capability (5.1) and the effective grading of repertoire (5.3).

Recommendations for works to be considered for inclusion in a "sampler" library could come directly from the performance experience of conductors.

5.2.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C., in consultation with the Canadian Music Centre, consider the long-term development of a graded tape library of Canadian repertoire samples which will be made available as part of the Canadian Music Centre's service to the orchestral community.

5.2.4. FUNDING

This project should be a co-operative venture between the O.A.C. and the Canadian Music Centre, with matching grant funding and clearly articulated objectives for an initial five-year period.

5.2.5. TIME LINE

Discussions should begin as soon as possible to determine funding requirements and the specifics of the project. Ideally, the first selection would be available by the end of the first year following implementation of this report.

5.3. CANADIAN REPERTOIRE: SUITABILITY

5.3.1. PROBLEM

Much work has been done in grading suitable Canadian compositions for school orchestras. This process has not yet been undertaken for a body of composition which has not been designated specifically for school use but which is playable by orchestras at varying levels of development, from those with major technical limitations to those approaching professional capability. At the same time, the resources of "school" labelled repertoire have not received attention from conductors working with orchestras at the beginning stages of growth.

5.3.2. DISCUSSION

Another aspect of accessibility lies in the grading of existing compositions, in terms of the instrumentation necessary and technical levels required for effective performance.

A model already exists for this in the work done by Patricia Shand. Her focus was specifically on repertoire for the elementary and secondary school. It is unfortunate that her graded lists, presently available from the Canadian Music Centre, are overlooked by adult orchestras searching for suitable material, when they see the word "school". Removing the word "school" from these publications would open up this repertoire for consideration.

Another immediate step towards improving accessibility will be possible when the new data base of the Canadian

Music Centre comes on line. Some indication of technical problems based on actual performance experience would be invaluable to conductors when choosing repertoire. This would require that the Canadian Music Centre requests from conductors their comments relating to technical requirements immediately following performances. It must be made clear that value judgments are not what is required.

One of the frequent comments from orchestras was the lack of Canadian arrangements of more popular – type composition. An unknown resource exists in the library of North Toronto Collegiate where, for the past 30 years, one of the most outstanding music programs in the province has gradually accumulated an excellent library of arrangements. Some way of accessing this resource should be developed.

The expertise of several conductors, whose interest in Canadian music has developed a particular expertise, also provides a resource which should be tapped for this purpose, i.e. Boris Brott, Jim Wegg and Kerry Stratton.

5.3.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C. provide financial assistance to the CMC for the purpose of developing a grading system of existing Canadian repertoire, suitable for orchestras at varying levels of technical skill, utilizing those conductors who have already developed considerable expertise in this area.

5.3.4. FUNDING

Since this is an activity which lies primarily within the mandate of the Canadian Music Centre, the O.A.C. should, in discussions with the Canadian Music Centre, determine the cost of such a project in terms of hours required and anticipated format for existing repertoire, with a view to providing a matching grant designated for this specific purpose.

5.3.5. TIME LINE

There is a substantial repertoire to be assessed. It will take time to work through. Completion time will depend on funding available and an assessment by the Canadian Music Centre of requirements.

5.4. NEW CANADIAN COMPOSITION: COMPOSER – IN – RESIDENCE

5.4.1. PROBLEM

While the proposals for grading and improved accessibility to the Canadian Music Centre are important, there is a need for composer involvement in writing for specific orchestras, i.e. in terms of their performance potential and their instrumentation. The commissioning program of the O.A.C. provides an important initiative for new composition, available to any Ontario orchestra. Unfortunately, there is no provision for a close association of composer and orchestra.

5.4.2. DISCUSSION

Given the wide performance capability range of Ontario's orchestras, funding support for a residency program, which would enable composers to work directly with a host orchestra and a community, would assist in developing new audiences for contemporary Canadian composition.

The interaction between composer and musicians on the one hand, and composer and audience on the other, is extremely limited. In fact, it can be argued that one reason for the difficulty in obtaining performances of Canadian compositions may be due to a lack of understanding, by both musicians and audiences, of the composer's intent. A composer – in – residence would be involved not only in writing for a specific orchestra but also in explaining what is happening, modifying requirements in the light of practical playing skills, and interacting with the audience in public performances.

The interest of composers in such a program is an unknown factor. Here, however, is a real need. Canadian composers should be writing for Ontario audiences in large and small centres, north and south, from Timmins to Ottawa to Sarnia. Given the present gap between Canadian composers and their own audiences, such a direct contact experience holds considerable potential for bridging that gap.

Long term residencies are likely inappropriate at this time. An initial proposal could provide funds for composers to be present at rehearsals and concerts before starting to write, and present at rehearsals of the composition after its completion. This would enable the composer to interact with musicians and rewrite as necessary. The composer should also prepare an explanatory introduction to the work for the audience, and be given time to answer questions from the audience.

There could possibly be a second performance from the orchestra.

Assessment of the program should be undertaken at the end of the first three-year cycle.

5.4.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C., in consultation with the Canadian Music Centre, develop a proposal for the establishment of a Composer-In-Residence program, in order to build a repertoire of Canadian composition suited to the different technical and musical needs of Ontario's varied orchestral community.

5.4.4. FUNDING

We suggest that 5 residencies be established at this time, for a maximum of $7,500 each. The total should be on a 2-for-1 dollar basis with the O.A.C. providing 2/3 of the cost. This figure will include the professional fee and all expenses. Contracts should specify the nature of the residency in terms of days spent in the community working with the orchestra and audience.

5.4.5. TIME LINE

The program should be introduced during the first year of the three-year cycle following implementation of this report.

5.5. FLEXIBILITY & ACCOUNTABILITY: A ROLE FOR OFSO

5.5.1. PROBLEM

As soon as an orchestra reaches a stage of development that requires a substantial number of full-time professional musicians, the stage is set for contract negotiations that frequently result in increasing rigidity and inflexibility in every aspect of the orchestra's operation.

5.5.2. DISCUSSION

The confrontational stance of professional musicians versus board and administration in the struggle for improved working conditions, and a decent living salary, is an historical tradition in North America. Unfortunately, this tradition has resulted, not only in an inability to react to quickly changing conditions, but also has resulted in crisis situations that threaten the existence of some orchestras.

Given the volunteer nature of boards, it is understandable that they do experience difficulty in refusing musicians' demands which are substantially

beyond the financial capability of the orchestra. The threat of strike and the dislocation of the orchestra, in the perception of the community, is too frequently avoided at all costs. Unfortunately, those costs can lead to the most serious of financial crises, and the charge of fiscal mismanagement. It does not help matters that board members, who agree to demands beyond ability to pay, can simply resign from the board without recrimination. By the same token, administrators should not be required to assume personal responsibility for board decisions resulting from disputes between conductors, musicians and the board.

The musicians justifiably feel that their artistry and skills are worthy of good working conditions and a decent living wage. At the same time, they are often poorly informed and/or uninvolved in the realities of the orchestra's financial position, unless the prospect of bankruptcy threatens the loss of jobs. For professional musicians outside of the Toronto Symphony, a relatively short playing season means scrambling for work elsewhere during a four to five – month period.

The most appropriate vehicle for developing processes and procedures which may improve musicians' understanding of the realities of an orchestra's continued existence, and enlisting their assistance in solving its problems, is OFSO. Funded from the outset by the O.A.C., as an important forum for the orchestral community, it is essential that OFSO provide a leadership role in this area.

Part of such a role might well include a professionally administered study, under OFSO auspices, of musicians' attitudes to various aspects of their work and their understanding of the realities of an orchestra's existence. Given the need for contract flexibility, the conditions under which the musicians would be prepared to participate in this study, should be explored as soon as possible.

5.5.3. RECOMMENDATION

That OFSO be asked by the O.A.C. to consult with the professional orchestral musicians of the province, to determine conditions which would prepare guidelines for desirable and acceptable levels of flexibility in contracts for full – time musicians, allowing for the particular circumstances of each orchestra, its community and accountability for public funding.

5.5.4. FUNDING

To be determined.

5.5.5. TIME LINE

Discussions focussed specifically on the issue of contract inflexibility should be initiated as soon as possible by the board of OFSO.

5.6. THE DEVELOPMENT OF BOARD EXPERTISE

5.6.1. PROBLEM

Although recommendations of previous studies concerning the need for board member development have been implemented, at least in part, the difficulty in building board expertise and maintaining board continuity is still a major stumbling block for orchestral stability, particularly in those orchestras approaching fully professional status.

5.6.2. DISCUSSION

Of the central components which form the foundation of an orchestra's existence, an effective board of directors remains the one where least progress has been made, in spite of workshops and programs initiated and implemented by OFSO.

Previous studies attempted to deal with this problem, but were hampered by an almost total lack of professionalism in the field. - There is now, however, available in the province, a small but proficient pool of orchestral management and board expertise. Tapping of this resource has begun but the process has just started. Outstanding administrators contacted during the study are both interested and prepared to share their skills and knowledge on a consultancy basis with other members of the orchestral community.

The board workshop sessions organized by OFSO suggest that there is potential for this kind of activity, but it needs to be expanded. As with any pioneering program, problems emerge through field experience. It is, for example, difficult to get board members out for workshops which may be beneficial. Perhaps there should be an attendance requirement at workshop – style training sessions for board members. Different methods of disseminating information regarding the role and responsibilities of board members, i.e. video – tape, should be explored.

The bottom line for orchestras is that they are completely hamstrung without a good board. Development of board expertise should be a major priority for both the O.A.C. and OFSO. To move an educational enterprise such as board training to a high

priority will, however, require financial support from both institutions.

Since fiscal responsibility is a central issue for a board, it may be possible to interest the private sector in funding participation for a program which would address this problem much more vigorously than at present. Principal components for such a program would include a long-term plan that prepares for growth over the next decade and a sustained series of on-site, "required" training sessions for orchestra boards. Such training sessions, as yet, play a minimal role in their orchestra's financial stability.

5.6.3. RECOMMENDATION

That a standing advisory committee, drawn from the pool of orchestral management and consultancy expertise now available in the province, be formed through OFSO to develop a corporate funding base and an operational structure for a long term, on-site program that will address the needs of board member training.

5.6.4. FUNDING

Funding for this recommendation would, appropriately, come from the orchestra, from the corporate sector and from the O.A.C., possibly on a matching dollar basis. An estimate of cost is difficult at this time, given the variables of funding sources and the nature of a more intensive program.

5.6.5. TIME LINE

Formation of the advisory committee should begin immediately and its recommendations implemented as soon as possible.

5.7. STRATEGIC PLANNING MODELS

5.7.1. PROBLEM

There are over 50 orchestras in the province. Most of these are on a growth curve, however modest. Integral to this growth process for boards and administrators is the need, at different stages of development, to tackle the problem area common to all, regardless of the unique mission of the orchestra, i.e. financial structure. At present, an orchestral version of the proverbial wheel is reinvented individually by each orchestra as it attempts to cope with new financial demands placed on it by growth.

5.7.2. DISCUSSION

The basic documentation developed by an orchestra, in terms of its mission statement, artistic policy and long-term plan, articulates its unique role in the community it serves. It follows that each orchestra will have problems unique to its mission. The one area, however, where it is possible to predict difficulties, and where similar problems are shared by all, is financing.

As an example, the cost of one full-time contracted professional musician adds a minimum of approximately $25,000 to the budget. This carries obvious implications for the financial structure of the operation. Planning in the past has largely been a matter of spontaneous decisions unrelated to any concept of orderly growth. While orchestras have survived in spite of this, it is dangerous to assume that such an ad hoc arrangement will continue in an increasingly difficult financial future.

The increasing sophistication and financial needs of the orchestral community suggest the time is now appropriate for the development of strategic planning models for orchestras at different stages of growth. Professional preparation of such models by firms such as Woods Gordon should be mandatory. The corporate sector, substantially involved in arts funding, may also contribute by making their expertise available in such areas as strategic planning.

OFSO is the appropriate vehicle for undertaking such a project and providing advisory assistance when implementing the results.

5.7.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C., in consultation and co-operation with OFSO and members of the orchestral community, assist in obtaining corporate funding for the development of strategic planning models, for orchestras at different levels of development.

5.7.4. FUNDING

Every effort should be made to obtain, from the corporate sector, their professional expertise in strategic planning, as a donation to the orchestra community. An initiative, involving the O.A.C., OFSO, representatives from orchestra boards and administrators with strong contacts in the business community, suggests a starting point for such a project.

5.7.5. TIME LINE

There should be immediate discussions concerning strategic planning models among the three components referred to above. Approaches to the corporate sector should be initiated within year one of the first three-year cycle. Completion of the models should be ready for the major assessment and replanning associated with the completion of that cycle by each orchestra.

5.8. AN EXPANDED ADMINISTRATIVE RESIDENCY PROGRAM

5.8.1. PROBLEM

One of the first problems identified in pioneering reports on Ontario orchestras was the lack of qualified and experienced administrators. There are now training programs at a number of Ontario post-secondary institutions, in addition to the course of study in arts management available at Banff. Unfortunately, the crucial element of practical apprenticeship, needed to balance theoretical studies, has not yet been incorporated into Canadian curricula.

5.8.2. DISCUSSION

It is now possible to enter post-secondary courses developed specifically for the preparation of arts administrators. For example, the Universities of Toronto and Waterloo and Confederation College all offer a form of professional training which, if not specifically designed for orchestra administrators with their special needs, does address, in more general terms, the areas of expertise needed for an administrative career in the arts.

In spite of important progress, two remaining problems emerged in discussions with administrators, music directors and board chairmen Given the importance of contract preparation and negotiation, as an orchestra grows, it is not surprising that the need for more attention to the skills of negotiation, and understanding of the legal framework within which contracts are developed, was frequently referred to. Equally important for future curriculum revision were observations from successful administrators, who emphasized the need for more supervised field experience as part of the training process. This was directed particularly to the "nuts and bolts" of orchestral life, starting with such mundane but crucial matters as setting up stands and chairs. Administrators need to know, from first-hand experience, the multitude of unglamorous tasks required to place an orchestra on stage for a concert.

Post – secondary institutions, particularly universities, are not known for the happy marriage of practice and theory. Where the emphasis in preparation is primarily on the theoretical aspects of arts management, the inexperienced graduate may see his/her role as essentially that of an executive, planning policies and far removed from the uninspiring requirements which characterize day – to – day orchestral life. At its worst, this may result in the "hire someone" syndrome as an all too convenient alternative to personal involvement or volunteers, even when the orchestra is financially unable to increase its payroll. In fact, given the present financial capability of the majority of Ontario orchestras, the full or part – time administrator must be capable of doing almost anything an orchestra requires, outside of conducting or playing an instrument.

Field experience, possibly in the form of an apprenticeship, is required in order to get a sense of what is involved in the role of an orchestra administrator in Ontario. If an apprenticeship program is not possible within the curriculum framework of existing arts administration programs, it should be undertaken through OFSO as a preliminary requirement prior to appointments.

Orchestras selected as training sites should be chosen from those which have effective and experienced administrations. Ideally, prospective administrators should have the opportunity to work with orchestras at different levels of development; however, the cost of this extended training would be prohibitive.

Implementation of the recommendation addressing this problem should include provision for assessment of the prospective administrator, and assessment of the effectiveness of the training program, at the end of the first three – year cycle.

5.8.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C., in co – operation with OFSO, investigate the possibility of expanding administrative residency programs, in order to provide short – term field experience for prospective orchestra administrators.

5.8.4. FUNDING

Provision for 4 field placements per year would provide, for a limited number of candidates, badly needed practical experience at a relatively low cost. A subsidy/scholarship/fellowship of $6,000 each, for a four – month term, would be the minimal cost of attracting the best candidates.

As this should be seen as an ongoing program, new money to the extent of $24,000 will be necessary.

5.8.5. TIME LINE

Discussion with OFSO and experienced orchestra administrators should be initiated as soon as possible. The program itself should be in place by the end of year one in the first three – year cycle.

5.9. THE RECOGNITION OF EXCELLENCE

5.9.1. PROBLEM

Although there are impressive achievements each year by individual orchestras in terms of administration, board effectiveness, the commissioning and performance of Canadian repertoire, artistic excellence, audience development, fund – raising, educational programming and in all other areas of orchestral life, there is presently no recognition of such excellence.

5.9.2. DISCUSSION

One of the most encouraging observations to emerge from our survey of some 46 Ontario orchestras was the existence of excellence in every aspect of orchestral functioning. At present, not only is there no vehicle for the recognition of excellence in its many forms, but the orchestral community itself is not aware of the accomplishments of its members.

In all of the problem areas which surfaced, as we proceeded with interviews and field visits, there was always at least one orchestra where the problem had been addressed and resolved with impressive results. First – rate administration, outstanding artistic achievement, imaginative audience development for contemporary music programs, effective educational programming, impressive community fund – raising, to name some of the more obvious accomplishments, now exist in Ontario.

Ontario orchestras, viewed as a major cultural resource, are at a stage of development where consideration should be given to raising their combined profile in the general community. At the same time, members of the orchestral community should become aware of the rising standards of achievement already attained in an Ontario setting.

Such recognition could be accomplished most effectively by some form of public presentation accompanied by a financial reward. This could be either an annual affair or at the end of each three – year cycle.

5.9.3. RECOMMENDATION

That excellence in all aspects of orchestral activity be recognized, through OFSO, in the form of financial awards and public recognition for outstanding achievement in educational programming, audience development, artistic excellence, musical direction, performance of Canadian music, marketing, fund – raising, board chairmanship and administration. Presentation of awards should be in a high profile setting, such as the Emmy or Oscar showcases.

5.9.4. FUNDING

Depending on the categories chosen for recognition and financial incentive, new money to the extent of $5,000 per category, plus a contribution to the costs of an awards night, will be required. Total funding will require a minimum of $50,000.

5.9.5. TIME LINE

Consultation with OFSO regarding procedure and planning should begin during year one of the first three – year cycle.

5.10. A FESTIVAL OF ORCHESTRAS

5.10.1. PROBLEM

At the present time there is no provision for interaction, particularly in terms of the musicians, among orchestras which place community service as their central priority.

5.10.2. DISCUSSION

In any area of activity, awareness of what others are doing, and interaction in a setting that allows sharing of ideas and accomplishments, is an important component for both personal and institutional growth. Performance resources of individual orchestras may be quite limited but when these resources are pooled, a high potential for exciting performance emerges, with subsequent stimulation for future growth.

The concept of the music festival has been around for a long time. Its capacity to adapt, ranges from the traditional competitive festivals for young instrumentalists, through festivals of youth orchestras, to festivals of folk fiddling where literally hundreds of string players combine to perform traditional folk music. To the best of our knowledge, application of the festival concept to adult orchestras has not occurred. Its potential, however, is substantial for bringing together members of orchestras involved principally in community service. Each orchestra may perform for their colleagues

in similar orchestras, and the musicians in all orchestras may combine to participate in large works which require massive resources well-beyond the capacity of the individual orchestra.

It might be effective to co-ordinate this festival concept with the previous recommendation (5.8.2.), to celebrate the conclusion of a three-year cycle.

5.10.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C., through OFSO, encourage and assist in the development of an Orchestra Festival for those orchestras whose primary focus is on community service.

5.10.4. FUNDING

O.A.C. involvement in funding should focus on the organizational costs involved in planning the festival. OFSO should be asked to prepare an initial plan, including an estimate of costs. At this time it is difficult to form an accurate estimate of the costs involved.

5.10.5. TIME LINE

Preparations should be completed in time for implementation as a celebration to mark the completion of the first three-year cycle.

5.11. LIBRARY RESOURCES & RESEARCH

5.11.1. PROBLEM

Over the past 20 years, a substantial literature dealing specifically with the symphony orchestra has appeared. While a valiant effort has been made by OFSO to develop a resource library, the assistance of a professional librarian is needed to catalogue and improve accessibility to existing materials. At the same time, the present collection needs steady expansion in the acquisition of new theses, research studies and monographs which focus on the orchestra, its history and its problems.

5.11.2. DISCUSSION

The best library resource for the orchestral community in Ontario is that which has been developed on a somewhat ad hoc basis by OFSO. This important collection in the OFSO office provided a starting point for this study. Holdings include partial collections of the important periodicals in the field, limited circulation reports prepared for various government agencies concerned with the arts, and clippings from the voluminous materials resulting from conferences.

At the same time, the kind of professional expertise necessary to keep up with new publications, research and monitoring of an effective clipping service has not been available. Files of important periodicals, such as Symphony Magazine, tend to be incomplete. Binding of periodicals for reference has consequently not yet commenced. While card indexes have been started, the up-dating needed to encompass new acquisitions in recent years has proceeded with difficulty.

There is also a question concerning whether or not the orchestra community is aware that such a resource exists. It is clear that OFSO is concerned about its role as a clearing house for materials concerning the symphony orchestra, but further attention is needed to turn it into an up-to-date resource, readily accessible to its members.

The bibliography prepared for this study, a small and selective fraction of existing material, indicates the richness of the available literature. The engagement of a part-time professional librarian, and the preparation of a long-term plan to develop a data base of this material, would seem both desirable and of some urgency, if the potential of this OFSO function is to be realized. As an initial step, the possibility of co-operating with the Canadian Music Centre in the utilization of their new data base, should be explored.

5.11.3. RECOMMENDATION

That the O.A.C. discuss with OFSO the possibility of expanding its library/clearing house activity, thereby increasing accessibility to library resources and developing research materials for the orchestral community.

5.11.4. FUNDING

Allocation of funding responsibility, through some form of cost-sharing among the O.A.C., OFSO and the orchestral community, would seem reasonable. Cost of a half-time professional librarian will be approximately $20,000 per year and there should be an annual budget for acquisitions of not less than $1,000. Included in the budget for OFSO's library service should be provision for the cost of duplication (where there is no copyright infringement) and mailing.

5.11.5. TIME LINE

Initial discussions between the O.A.C. and OFSO should begin as soon as possible.

5.12. OFSO & THE REPORTING OF STATISTICAL DATA

5.12.1. PROBLEM

ACO and OFSO annually collect and publish important comparative statistical information about member orchestras, including a large number from Ontario. Unfortunately, there seems to be no common guidelines for calculating such items as potential audience, accessible population, etc. Each orchestra has its own method of compiling statistical information. At the same time, some data has simply not been made available, although that same information may be included in submissions to the O.A.C. Finally, there appears to be no routine method for checking errors for data entered into the OFSO data base.

5.12.2. DISCUSSION

The annual statistics compiled by OFSO were not as useful to this study as they might have been, primarily because of missing items, data entry errors and different methods of calculating various requested items.

A revision of the data form has now been completed and is a major improvement over the old form. However, an information booklet providing a recommended method for calculating items would be most useful in developing a reliable statistical base for the orchestral community.

To have come this far with their annual publication of orchestral statistics is already an accomplishment. The next stage should be the development of procedures which will ensure the accuracy of data entry.

5.12.3. RECOMMENDATION

That common practices for the reporting of statistical data to OFSO be developed and that member orchestras all be requested to use these common practices.

That procedures be developed to ensure the accuracy of data entry.

5.12.4. FUNDING

This should not be an expensive item, although data entry should be handled by qualified personnel. The University of Waterloo, which developed the new data form, should be able to make suggestions regarding procedures for checking data entry. Common reporting practice should be the result of consultation among representatives of the O.A.C., OFSO and the administrators of the orchestral community.

5.12.5. TIME LINE

New operating procedures should be in place in time for the next annual collection of data.

5.13. AN ONTARIO REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR OFSO

5.13.1. PROBLEM

The incredible expansion of Ontario orchestras in the past 20 years is not reflected in the staff capabilities of OFSO. The combined offices of ACO and OFSO are inadequately staffed to look after the needs of all Canadian orchestras of which the majority are found in Ontario.

5.13.2. DISCUSSION

When OFSO was formed in the late 1950's, it made economic sense, at that early stage of development, to combine its resources with those of the national organization, the Association of Canadian Orchestras. Since then, the orchestral explosion, particulary in Ontario, has resulted in a work over-load that now urgently requires the appointment of a full-time professional to look after the needs of Ontario orchestras.

The development of regional directors for the Canadian Music Centre suggests a model that might be useful for structural changes in the ACO/OFSO consortium.

5.13.3. RECOMMENDATION

That a full-time professional staff member be appointed in the ACO/OFSO office, whose sole responsibility will be the Ontario orchestras.

5.13.4. FUNDING

Salary for a regional officer, responsible exclusively for Ontario orchestras, will be approximately $40,000.

5.13.5. TIME LINE

The introduction of a regional officer should be implemented as soon as possible, particularly in view of OFSO's increased role as proposed in this report.

5.14. PERFORMANCE SPACE COSTS

5.14.1. PROBLEM

Orchestras have a particular problem arising from the expenditure of large sums of money which are required to rent performance space.

5.14.2. DISCUSSION

Public libraries, museums and art galleries are able to expend their funds directly for the provision of cultural services. The required physical space is usually financed by the host community or through other forms of direct subsidy.

Orchestras are seriously at a disadvantage in that they must use a substantial portion of their funds for the rental of space in which to perform. The cost is enormous. In a city such as Thunder Bay, hall rental costs are barely covered by O.A.C. grant. Similar situations exist wherever there is a performing arts centre. Even where an orchestra utilizes venues other than concert halls, the cost of hall rental is a major financial burden.

Recognition of the extent of this burden will be a first step towards changing the manner in which a suitable performance place is made available to orchestras. Development of such an awareness might, most appropriately, be done through a lobbying initiative by OFSO.

5.14.3. RECOMMENDATION

That OFSO take the initiative in promoting an awareness of the financial burden that the cost of performance space rental places upon its members and that it lobby for a reduction of this burden through performance space subsidies similar to those currently in place for other public cultural institutions.

5.14.4. FUNDING

None required.

5.14.5. TIME LINE

Such a campaign should be developed over the next year and sustained over the next 3 years, or until some relief is obtained for its member orchestras.

SECTION 6

A SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SECTION 3

- That each orchestra applying for funding will develop, in consultation with the O.A.C., four documents: a mission statement, an artistic policy, a plan for the current year which includes complete budget data and a long-term plan for the development of the orchestra.

- That the result of an orchestra's documentation and discussions with the O.A.C. will be a contract to meet the agreed objectives of the orchestra in return for funding support.

- That final responsibility for initiating and fulfilling a contractual commitment for funding support between each orchestra and the O.A.C. rests with the orchestra's Board of Directors. No further Council funding will be considered without that contractual commitment from the Board of Directors.

- That the present descriptive divisions of orchestras currently used by the O.A.C. (major, professional, community), each with its attendant set of guidelines for grant assessment, be modified to allow for greater flexibility and input on the part of each orchestra, recognizing the individuality of each and with different weightings for the four essential components: administrative and fiscal responsibility, community service, artistic achievement and community support.

- That evaluation should rest on the documents dealing with mission, artistic policy and long-term plan. The four central components should be artistic achievement, fiscal responsibility, community service and community support. The relative weight given to each of these will form part of the basic documentation for the orchestra, and should be the result of negotiation and consensus between the orchestra and the O.A.C.

- That the O.A.C., in consultation with the orchestral community and an expert in matrix design, should prepare, during the first three-year cycle, a system based on community support, community service, fiscal responsibility and artistic achievement for assessing applications for grant assistance and recording orchestral development.

- That, to assist orchestras in understanding the evaluation process, an illustrative set of potential goals, objectives and guidelines for determining achievement of various kinds, plus definition of fiscal responsibility, community service and community support be drawn up and used as a starting point in the interaction between orchestras and the O.A.C.

- That as part of its mission statement, each orchestra will be asked to realistically define its potential audience constituency.

- That the funding ceiling for orchestras described by the term "community" and the requirement that Council support be tied directly to professional artists be dropped immediately and that all orchestras be eligible for operating grant funding on the same basis.

- That the freeze on the funding for new orchestras and multiple orchestras in a community be removed immediately. All orchestras, whether currently funded or not, should be eligible for funding within the parameters of the new guidelines.

- That a New Orchestra Program be established with the necessary mechanisms to determine eligibility criteria, assessment procedures and a list of potential goals and objectives.

- That an Innovation/Risk Program be established immediately with a procedure acceptable to the orchestral community for evaluating the merit of proposals.

- That an Isolation Travel Assistance fund be established for orchestras in remote centres in Ontario, to help meet travel costs in bringing soloists and orchestral musicians into these communities to fill agreed upon needs. Such assistance would be granted on an increasing scale depending on the distance from a major professional musician resource pool, and must be consistent with the orchestra's objectives.

- That a Resident Musician Program receive high priority, providing that its requirements are carefully articulated and providing that it is monitored on a regular basis. If at all possible, consideration should be given to sending out a minimum of 2 professionals for any residency site.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SECTION 4

- That Community Based Revenue, derived from a combination of earned revenue, private sector revenue and local government revenue, be used as the principal measure of community support for orchestras in Ontario.

- That the present level of operating grant funding for all orchestras within the mandate of this study be established as a starting point for future development, hereafter referred to as New Cycle Base Funding or NCBF.

- That, starting with the year of implementation of this proposal, and providing that the criteria set forth in 4.4 are met, each presently funded orchestra will be guaranteed 90% of the NCBF for each year, for a period of 3 years. The NCBF will be initially set at the level of operating funding for each orchestra in the year of implementation. Further, each orchestra, providing that it meets criteria set forth in 4.5, will be eligible for an additional achievement grant as follows:

  Year 1: up to 12% of NCBF
  Year 2: up to 14% of NCBF
  Year 3: up to 16% of NCBF

- To be eligible for 90% guaranteed funding over the three-year cycle of NCBF, each orchestra must continue to meet generally accepted standards of administrative and fiscal responsibility, must maintain its status as a non-profit society and must complete its season as proposed in its one-year operating plan and budget. Each orchestra's board of directors must be formally committed to its basic requirements for funding support.

- That, to receive additional achievement grants of up to 12%, 14% and 16% over the three-year period, the orchestra must demonstrate its degree of success in meeting the objectives outlined in its one-year operating plan and its adherence to policies outlined in its mission and artistic policy statements. There should also be an assessment by the O.A.C. of the orchestra's success in meeting agreed upon guidelines for community support, community service, administrative and fiscal responsibility and artistic achievement.

- That the O.A.C. not accept grant applications which include requests for granting assistance which are in excess of NCBF guidelines: all requests for grant assistance in excess of these guidelines must be directed to the O.A.C. through project grant applications.

- That, at the end of every three-year cycle, the NCBF be adjusted either up or down by taking 90% of the NCBF and adding the achievement grant level in year 3, or an average of the 3 years, whichever is higher.

- That the three-year adjusted NCBF also include the transfer of project funds to operating funds, providing that a project funded program has been successfully sustained for a three-year period and that all other operating grant conditions have been met.

- That a Resource Pool be established to finance the two new programs: the Innovation/Risk Program and the New Orchestra Program.

- That, given the size of a large and growing orchestral community, the increased demands on the professional services of the music section officers which will result from the implementation of the recommendations in this report and the current need for more direct field contact between the O.A.C. and each individual orchestra, there be an increase in music section staff of at least two full-time professionals to handle the new support, development and assessment procedures.

- That in order to deal with financial crises, the O.A.C. recommend to the Ministry of Citizenship & Culture that it establish a Financial Stabilization Fund to which an orchestra in difficulty can turn for help. Determination of the extent of the crisis will be by an appointed advisory committee from the orchestral community. Funds will then be made available, within a contractual commitment between the orchestra and the Ministry, for a low interest loan and a five-year loan repayment and deficit reduction program.

- That any increase in funding for orchestras beyond the NCBF guidelines be priorized as follows: O.A.C. support services recommended in this report; operating grant increases to address present "historical" anomalies; and, project grants (new orchestras, innovation/risk, audience development, etc).

- That funding be withheld from orchestras which deliberately withhold information, or provide misleading information, on grant applications.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SECTION 5

- That the O.A.C., in consultation with the Canadian Music Centre, develop a proposal for the establishment of a Field Service Program to increase accessibility to existing Canadian repertoire. Assessment of the effectiveness of this program should take place following completion of the first three – year cycle.

- That the O.A.C., in consultation with the Canadian Music Centre, consider the long – term development of a graded tape library of Canadian repertoire samples which will be made available as part of the Canadian Music Centre's service to the orchestral community.

- That the O.A.C. provide financial assistance to the CMC for the purpose of developing a grading system of existing Canadian repertoire, suitable for orchestras at varying levels of technical skill, utilizing those conductors who have already developed considerable expertise in this area.

- That the O.A.C., in consultation with the Canadian Music Centre, develop a proposal for the establishment of a Composer – In – Residence program, in order to build a repertoire of Canadian composition suited to the different technical and musical needs of Ontario's varied orchestral community.

- That OFSO be asked by the O.A.C. to consult with the professional orchestral musicians of the province, to determine conditions which would prepare guidelines for desirable and acceptable levels of flexibility in contracts for full – time musicians, allowing for the particular circumstances of each orchestra, its community and accountability for public funding.

- That a standing advisory committee, drawn from the pool of orchestral management and consultancy expertise now available in the province, be formed through OFSO to develop a corporate funding base and an operational structure for a long term, on – site program that will address the needs of board member training.

- That the O.A.C., in consultation and co – operation with OFSO and members of the orchestral community, assist in obtaining corporate funding for the development of strategic planning models, for orchestras at different levels of development.

- That the O.A.C., in co – operation with OFSO, investigate the possibility of expanding administrative residency programs, in order to provide short – term field experience for prospective orchestra administrators.

- That excellence in all aspects of orchestral activity be recognized, through OFSO, in the form of financial awards and public recognition for outstanding achievement in educational programming, audience development, artistic excellence, musical direction, performance of Canadian music, marketing, fund-raising, board chairmanship and administration. Presentation of awards should be in a high profile setting, such as the Emmy or Oscar showcases.

- That the O.A.C., through OFSO, encourage and assist in the development of an Orchestra Festival for those orchestras whose primary focus is on community service.

- That the O.A.C. discuss with OFSO the possibility of expanding its library/clearing house activity, thereby increasing accessibility to library resources and developing research materials for the orchestral community.

- That common practices for the reporting of statistical data to OFSO be developed and that member orchestras all be requested to use these common practices.

  That procedures be developed to ensure the accuracy of data entry.

- That a full-time professional staff member be appointed in the ACO/OFSO office, whose sole responsibility will be the Ontario orchestras.

- That OFSO take the initiative in promoting an awareness of the financial burden that the cost of performance space rental places upon its members and that it lobby for a reduction of this burden through performance space subsidies similar to those currently in place for other public cultural institutions.

SECTION 7

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACO. (1988). "Artistic Policy Questionnaire," for proposed study.

ACO. Tomorrow's Audience Today: A Newsletter published by the Education Committee of ACO.

Appelbaum, Louis. (1968). "Toronto's Orchestral Resources," mimeo, pp.108.

Armenian, R., Cole, B. & Noble, T. (1985). "A New Future For The KWSO," Kitchener, mimeo, pp.6.

Arian, Edward. (1984). "The San Diego Symphony Turnaround," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.35, June/July, 1984, pp.60 – 63ff.

ASOL. (1983). "Orchestra Education Programs: A Comparative Report and Directory of Education and Outreach Programs," American Symphony Orchestra League.

Atherton, N., Philips, G., Bhutani, R. (1980). "Aesthetic and Economic Man: A Study in Motivation," **O.C.S.M. Newsletter**, March, 1980, Vol.3, No.3, pp.33 – 42.

Auerbach, Mark G. (1984). "Marketing An Orchestra Through The Travel Network," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.35, August/September, 1984, pp.59 – 60.

Ball, Walter. (1968). "Report To The Ontario Federation Of Symphony Orchestras," mimeo, pp.19.

Biddle, Livingston L. (1978). "Symphonies and the Endowment," **Symphony News**, Vol.28, August, 1978, pp.16 – 20.

Billington, D. (1974). "The Montreal Symphony: Anatomy of a Crisis," **Performing Arts Canada**, Vol. 11, No.2, 1974, pp.14 – 17.

Black, Ralph. (1985). "Where To Look For The New Trustee/ Volunteer," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, August/September, 1985, p.48.

Black, Ralph. (1983). "Memo To The Search Committee: What To Look For In a Symphony Manager," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.34, April/May, 1983, p.43.

Black, Ralph. (1983). "Why You Were Elected to the Orchestra Governing Board," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.34, Dec., 1983, p.6.

Black, Ralph. (1985). "Fireworks: 20 Questions That Symphony Orchestras Should Ask – But Never Do," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, April/May, 1985, p.47.

Black, Ralph. (1987). "Symphony Jewels: Diamonds, Pearls, and Rubies," Symphony Magazine, Vol.38, August/September, 1987, p.40.

Black, Ralph. (1986). "Ten Common Symphony Problems ... Revisited," Symphony Magazine, Vol.37, June/July, 1987, p.118ff.

Black, Ralph. (1986) "Thirteen Ways To Tell If Our Orchestra Is Successful," Symphony Magazine, Vol.37, February/March, 1986, pp.44 – 45.

Black, Ralph. (1986). "Why One Orchestra Succeeds, and Another Fails ... Or Does Not Reach Its Potential," Symphony Magazine, Vol.37, 1986, p.54ff.

Black, Ralph. (1983). "Why Symphony Orchestras Are Not Self – Supporting," Symphony Magazine, Vol.34, February/March, 1983, p.?

Black, Ralph. (1982). "Choosing The New Symphony Board Member," Symphony Magazine, Vol.33, December, 1982, p.45.

Black, Ralph. The Best of Black Notes, Washington: ASOL. [collection of Black's articles from Symphony Magazine.]

Bray, Carne & Associates. (1980). "Report on the OCSM Survey to The Association of Canadian Orchestras and The Organization of Canadian Symphony Musicians," Toronto, mimeograph, pp.16.

Brun, Denise. (1985). "Symphony Nova Scotia: An Orchestra is Born," Performing Arts Canada, Spring, 1985, pp.24 – 25.

Buckley, William F. (1981). "A Conservative Speaks Out On Government Funding," Symphony Magazine, Vol.32, August/September, 1981, pp. 14 – 16.

Burdick, Daniel. (1986). "The Search For A Music Director," Symphony Magazine, Vol.37, April/May, 1986, pp.25 – 27ff.

Burgess, Norman E. (1982). "The Saskatoon Symphony Society In Relation To Its Education Program: An Analysis and Report," mimeo, pp.14.

Burlingame, Marshall. (1983). "Concert Productions's New Ally": A Computer Learns the Score," Symphony Magazine, Vol.34, February/March, 1983, pp.11 – 13.

Burton, Stephen Douglas. (1983). "The Emperor's New Clothes Or, Contemporary Music Revisited," Symphony Magazine, Vol.34, June/July, 1983, pp.59 – 63.

"Canadian Orchestras an Endangered Species?" **Performing Arts Canada**, Vol.17, No.2, 1980, p.14.

"Can We Do With Fewer Violins? Here's How," **O.C.S.M. Newsletter**, Vol.7, No.1, October, 1983, pp.23 – 24.

Carrington, Mark. (1983). "6 Orchestras Adopt a Composer," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.34, February/March, 1983, pp.24 – 26ff.

Clarke, Keith. (1986). "A Way of Loving Music," **Classical Music**, October 4, 1986, pp.8 – 9.

Clarkson, Harold. (1983). "Canadian Musicians in Canadian Orchestras," **O.C.S.M. Newsletter**, Vol.7, No.2, December, 1983, pp.23 – 28.

"The Cold War," (1976). **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.26, August, 1975, pp.16 – 17.

Cole, Barry. (1975). "The St. Lawrence Symphony Orchestra: A Model for a Feasibility Study," A report for the Board of Directors, Kingston Symphony Association, mimeo, pp.9.

Conrad, D. (1974). "The Orchestra Associations Get A Canada Council Cold Shower," **Performing Arts Canada**, Vol.11, No.2, 1974, pp.444 – 45.

"Collaboration Pays Off: Denver Settles Early," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.34, October/November, 1983, p.7ff, reprint from **Senza Sordino**.

Commanday, Robert. (1980). "The Symphony Orchestra – An Island of Sanity," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.31, October, 1980, pp.9 – 11ff. [Reply to Gunther Schuller.]

"Contract Provisions: Reading Between The Lines," (1976). **Symphony News**, Vol.27, June, 1976, pp.17 – 18.

Corey, Gerald. (1980). "Letter to the editor, Oct.16/80, on subject of audition procedures in Canada," **O.C.S.M. Newsletter**, Vol.4, No.2, November, 1980, pp.13 – 16.

Creech, G. & Houlton, N. (1985). "The Orchestra And The Community," pp.13 + appendices.

Creech, G. & Laleune M. (1987). "Guidelines for Support: Community Orchestras and Professional Orchestras," pp.4.

Creech, G. & Laleune M. (1987). "Music Office Sounding: June 25, 1987, Final Report," pp.11 + list of participants.

Davidson, Hugh. (1977). Letter to Dr. T.H.B. Symons, Jan. 24/77, on subject of opportunities for Canadian musicians, definition of excellence, the issue of "internationalization".

Dean, Ruth C. (1985). "The NEA's 20 Years of Commitment," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, October/November, 1985, pp.28 – 31.

"Deficits Lower Symphony Pitch," **Performing Arts Canada**, Vol.16, No.4, 1979, p.14 ff.

Education and Outreach. **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.32, June/July, 1981, special section on the theme of learning – classroom, youth and pre – professional orchestras, concert hall & community.

A First Hearing: Concerts For Young People
How Does An Orchestra Differ From A Band: etc
Atlanta's Symphonic Boy Scouts
Children's Concerts: Slim Goodbody's Healthy Alternative
Yamaha's Prodigies Take Center Stage In Washington
The Youth Orchestra Experience
San Francisco Symphony Forms A Youth Orchestra
NOA And The Training Orchestra Concept
A Festival of Learning In South Florida
A Nine – Pronged Community Enrichment Program in Milwaukee

Engstrom, Bengt Olof. (1985). "Repertoire responsibility and program planning," Stockholm, mimeo, pp.5.

Ericass Management. (1983). "Survey of Performing Arts Organizations For Ontario Arts Council," pp.12 + appendices.

Ferner, David C. "The Endowment Campaign: What's Your State of Readiness?" Part I, **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, August/September, 1985, pp.26 – 29.

Ferner, David C. "The Endowment Campaign: What's Your Plan of Action?" Part II, **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, December, 1985, 49 – 53ff.

Ferner, David C. "The Endowment Campaign: Orchestras Set New Records," Part III, **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.37, August/September, 1986, pp.12 – 15.

Fireworks Session. (1981). **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.32, October/November, 1981, pp.15 – 19ff.

Fireworks X. (1985). "What They Might Not Tell You At Home," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, August/September, 1985, pp.38 – 43. [panel discussion at ASOL annual meeting, San Francisco.]

Fleischmann, Ernest. (1980). "Conductors In America: A Response," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.31, October, 1980, pp.18 – 20.

Fleischmann, Ernest. (1986). "Why We Must Work With Arts Educators," Symphony Magazine, Vol.37, February/March, 1987, pp.32 – 33.

Fleischmann, Ernest. (1987). "The Orchestra Is Dead. Long Live The Community of Musicians," Address given at the commencement exercises of the Cleveland Institute of Music, May 1987, pp.14.

Fortier, Andre. (1977) "The Canada Council: The Principle of Excellence and Its Implications in a Democratic Society," mimeo, pp.17.

Fortier, Andre. (1974). "Is There a Future for the Symphony Orchestra in Canada?". Notes for a talk at the Joint Conference of the Association of Canadian Orchestras and the Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras, Hamilton, mimeo, pp.11, plus an unidentified reply to the address, pp.7.

Fraser, Hugh. (1986). "Hamilton's `orchestra' has evolved through the years," Performing Arts, November 1986, pp.56 – 58.

Frevert, Richard A. (1984). "The Audience Survey," Symphony Magazine, Vol.35, August/September, 1984, pp.38 – 41.

Fromm, P. (1981). "The Role of Symphony Orchestra Boards," Symphony News, Vol.32, No.5, 1981, pp.22 – 25.

Frye, Northrop. (1976). "National Consciousness in Canadian Culture," Transactions Of The Royal Society Of Canada, Series IV, Vol.XIV, Pp.57 – 69.

Gonzalez, Lisa. (1978). "How Does Your Orchestra Rate?" Symphony News, Vol.28, pp.18 – 19.

Goodman, Stanley J. (1981). "The Hard Head And The Soft Heart: An Action Strategy for the Arts in the Coming Crisis," Symphony Magazine, Vol.32, August/September, 1981, pp.26 – 30ff.

Gray, John. (1988). "Question: Why Is The VSO In Trouble? Answer: When Hasn't The VSO Been In Trouble!" Vancouver Sun Magazine, February 1988, pp.10 – 11.

Hall, Tom. (1982). "Talking To Teenagers About Music," Symphony Magazine, Vol.33, June/July, 1982, pp.76 – 78

Hart, P. (1973). "The Educational Role of the Symphony Orchestra," Music Educators Journal, Vol.60, December, 1973, pp.26 – 29ff.

Hart, P. (1973). Orpheus in the New World: The Symphony Orchestra as an American Cultural Institution – Its Past, Present and Future, New York: W.W. Norton, pp.562.

Hershenson, Roberta. (1986). "The Now Story: New York's Suburban "Miracle"," Symphony Magazine, Vol.37, June/July, 1986, pp.65 – 69.

Hiestand, Michael. (1982). "Reaching Out To The Young," American Arts, May, 1982, pp.24 – 26.

Hollander, Lorin. (1984). "Music, Creativity, and the Path to Enlightenment," Symphony Magazine, Vol.35, August/September, 1984, pp.13 – 17ff. [Joint National Conference of Canadian and American Symphony orchestra communities in Toronto, June 5 – 9).

Homfray, T. (1987) "West Country Tales," Classical Music, November 7, 1987, pp.12 – 15. [successful English touring orchestra]

Houlton, Neil. (1986) "Program Evaluation: Commissioning," O.A.C., mimeo, pp.9.

Kammerman, Jack B. (1979). "The Symphony Orchestra Conductor: A Study of the Career of an Occupation," Ph.D., New York University, reviewed by Robert L. Cowden, CRME Bulletin No.70, Spring 1982, pp.27 – 30.

Kay, Graeme. (1986). "Birmingham Plan: Bad News For London Orchestras?" Classical Music, October 18, 1986, p.5.

Kay, Graeme. (1987). "Going For Gold," Classical Music, April 25, 1987, p.11.

Kermani, Peter R. (1982). "Artistic Policy: Every Orchestra Must Have One," Symphony Magazine, Vol.33, October/November, 1982, pp.11 – 21.

Kilburn, Nicholas. (1980). "The Employment of Orchestral Musicians: Community Responsibility," O.C.S.M. Newsletter, August, 1980, Vol.3, No.4, pp.13 – 16.

Kilburn, Nicholas. (1983). "Orchestras: A Matter of Training and Boards," Musicanada, October 1983, pp.4 – 5.

Kilburn, Nicholas. (1986). Letter to the editor, "Our Orchestras – Need Young Canadians Apply: A Clarification," O.C.S.M. Newsletter, Vol.9, No.4, May, 1986, p.14.

Kiraly, Philippa. (1984). "Youth Concerts Come Of Age," Symphony Magazine, Vol.35, February/March, 1984, pp.25 – 29ff.

Kozinn, Allan. (1983). "The American Composers Orchestra: Building an Esterhazy Court?" Symphony Magazine, Vol.34, June/July, 1983, pp.23 – 27.

Kozinn, Allan. (1985). "The Music Director: Changing Times Changing Roles," Part I, Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, pp.9 – 14ff.

Kozinn, Allan. (1985). "The Music Director: Changing Times Changing Roles," Part II, Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, pp.21 – 27ff,

Kraemer, Franz. (1979). "The State of Canadian Orchestras: A Paper Presented to the Canada Council," mimeo, pp.27 + appendix.

Land, Mary Spalding. (1979). "The Role of Counselling in the Career Development of Musicians – A Case Study," Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Lane, Chester. (1980). "Leonard Bernstein On Orchestras: No Time For Apathy," Symphony Magazine, Vol.31, August, 1980, pp.18 – 20.

Larking, Rosemary. (1985). "Music for All in Boston," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, June/July, 1985, pp.64 – 66.

Lussier, Charles. (1977). "The Canada Council: The Principle of Excellence and Its Implications in a Democratic Society," Notes for an Address to the Annual management Development Program, Harvard University Institute in Arts Administration, Cambridge, Massachusetts, mimeo, pp.17.

Macaulay, R. (chairman) (1984) "Report of the Special Committee For The Arts," Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture.

MacSkimming, Roy. (1983). For Arts' Sake: A History of the Ontario Arts Council 1963 – 1983, Toronto: O.A.C., 1983, pp.72.

McLane, Albert P. (1985). Letter under heading "Can Conducting Be Taught?" replying to article "Dialogue on Conductor Training," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, 1985, p.8.

Machan, Claire. (1986). KW Symphony: The first 40 years, Kitchener: Ainsworth Press, pp.75.

Major, Mike. (1985). "Managing Rapid Growth: The Oregon Symphony Story," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, June/July, 1985, pp.60 – 63.

[Management: Symphony Magazine, Vol.33, August/September did a major project on administration, internships, leadership etc.]

[Management: "Resource Guide," Symphony Magazine, Vol.33, August/September, 1982, pp.46 – 49. Compiled for novitiates in orchestra management.]

Marathon Medley. (1985) "The Vital Work of Volunteers," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, June/July, 1985, pp.145 – 148.

Markov, Robert. (1986) "The Growing Pains Of Our Orchestras," Music Magazine, Vol.9, No.3, May/June, 1986, pp.6 – 10.

Marty, Quentin Gerard. (1982). "Influences of Selected Family Background, Training, and Career Preparation Factors on the Career Development of Symphony Orchestra Musicians: A Pilot Study," Ph.D., University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music, reviewed by Richard Weerts, CRME Bulletin #78, Spring 1984, pp.80 – 84.

Maycock, Robert. (1986). Interview with John Drummond, Music Control, B.B.C. "Why funding can't cover a failure of courage," Classical Music, July 12, 1986, p.7.

McLean, P. (1985). "The Albany Symphony's Daring Path,: HiFi/Musical America, vol.35, April, 1985, pp.28 – 29.

Moore, Donald J. (1985). "Orchestra Management By Microcomputer: An Opportunity and a Challenge," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, October/November, 1985, pp.16 – 22ff.

Morehead, P. (1980). "Orchestral Training In Canada: A New Venture," Symphony News, Vol.31, February/March, 1980, pp.17 – 19.

Morrison, Richard. (1985). "Canada: hard – won gains face leaner times," Classical Music, May 25, 1985, pp.7 – 9.

Mulgan, Felicity. (1986). "Brott's eclectic Pops please crowds," Performing Arts Magazine, September, 1986, p.45.

Najar, Leo M. (1985). Notes taken at Najar's presentation, Sarnia Conference of OFSO, May 11th, 1985, pp.3, audio tape available at ACO/AFSO Resource Library.

Najar, Leo M. (1985). "Tools for Artistic Planning," mimeo, pp.3.

Najar, Leo M. (1984). "Conductors and Music Directors: A World of Difference," Symphony Magazine, Vol.35, p.6.

National Endowment For The Arts. (1985). "Audiences – Overview, 1987 – 1991 Planning Document," Washington, D.C., mimeo.

National Symphony Launches Major Endowment Drive. (1984). Symphony Magazine, Vol.35, December, 1984, pp.96 – 97.

Nord, Edward. (1982). "Building Audiences For The Future – What About The Present?" Symphony Magazine, Vol.33, p.8.

Ontario Arts Council. (1988) "Minutes From Orchestra 2001 Sounding, April 9, 1988," pp.12.

Ontario Federation of Orchestras. (1983). "Brief To The Special Committee For The Arts, Ministry Of Citizenship And Culture," mimeo, pp.14.

Ontario Federation of Orchestras. (1980). "Recommendations For The Future: A Report Of The OFSO Task Force," mimeo, pp.18.

Olmstead, Bob. (1983). "Computerization: Another Side To Orchestral Programming," Symphony Magazine, Vol.34, February/March, 1983, pp.31 – 33.

"Orchestras Develop Survival Strategies," Performing Arts Canada, Vol.17, No.2, 1980, p.14.

Pavey, S. (1984). "The Community Orchestra," Music Teacher, Vol.63, October, 1984, pp.19ff.

Pavillard, Dan. (1983). "Mobilizing For Survival In Long Beach," Symphony Magazine, Vol.34, April/May, 1983, pp.18 – 20ff.

Peyser, J. ed. (1985). The Orchestra: Origins and Transformations, New York: Scribner's, 1985, pp.671.

Phillips, Paul. (1986). "Young Music For Young Players: A Concerted Effort in Greensboro," Symphony Magazine, Vol.37, August/September, 1986, pp.16 – 18.

Pipirek, Max. (1981). Stress and Music: Medical, Psychological, Sociological, and Legal Strain Factors in a Symphony Orchestra Musician's Profession, Vienna: Wilhelm Braumuller, pp.78.

Plute, T. (1974). "Import Musicians: Bootleg or Benefit," Symphony News, Vol.25, No.6, 1974, pp.6 – 9.

Polisi, Joseph W. (1985). "Conductor Training: A Rational Plan For The Future," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, June/July, 1985, p.12ff.

Pratley, David. (1986). "Artists v. plutocrats at Vancouver think – tank," Classical Music, Aug.23, 1986, p.6.

Previn, Andre (1981). Orchestra, New York: Doubleday, pp.154.

Quigley, Michael. (1984). "Hamilton's Musical Century," Symphony Magazine, Vol.35, June/July, 1984, pp.30 – 35.

Regional Orchestra Players Association. [basis & formation] Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, February/March, 1985, p.44.

Reisman, Barabara & Compa, Lance. (1986). "The Case For Adversarial Unions," O.C.S.M. Newsletter, May 1986, Vol.9, No.4, pp.18 – 27. Reprinted from Harvard Business Review, May – June 1985.

Research Bibliography of the Cultural Industries. (circa 1980). "Futures," Arts Research Monograph #4, mimeo, pp.86.

Roberson Centre for the Arts and Sciences. (1969). "Is The Concert Scene Dying," Third Conference – Workshop Report.

Robinson, Joseph. (1987). "Players and Proselytes: Take Your Oboist To Lunch," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.38, February/March, 1987, pp.8 – 11.

Rockwell, John. (1987). "Many Orchestras In Financial Straits," **The New York Times**, January 19, 1987, Section C11.

Rodewald, Albert. (1978). "Chamber Orchestras Establish Their Uniqueness," **Symphony News**, Vol.28, October, 1978, pp.15 – 17.

Rozek, Michael. (1985). "Musicians and Medicine: Is There a Doctor in the House?" **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, February/March, 1985, pp.9 – 12.

"San Diego Symphony Returns," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.38, August/September, 1987, p.51.

Sargous, Harry. (1980). "Food For Thought," **O.C.S.M. Newsletter**, March, 1980, Vol.3, No.3, pp.51 – 54.

Schabas, Ezra. (1976). "Toronto's New Orchestra," mimeo, pp.36.

Schabas, Ezra. (1966). "Ontario Community Orchestras," mimeo, pp.88.

Schabas, Ezra & Streatfield, Simon. (1983). "A Report On Orchestral Music In New Brunswick And Its Development," mimeo, pp.24 + appendices.

Schafer, R. Murray. (1985). "Concert spaces: a less orthodox view," **Musicanada**, November, 1985, p.5.

Schuller, Gunther. (1980). "A Discussion of Gunther Schuller's Article "The Trouble With Orchestras," **Journal of the Conductors' Guild**, Vol.1, Fall, 1980, pp.17 – 23.

Schuller, Gunther. (1979). "The State of Our Art," **Symphony News**, Vol.29, December, 1979, pp.15 – 18ff.

Schuller, Gunther. (1980). "The Trouble With Orchestras," **O.C.S.M. Newsletter**, Vol.4, No.1, pp.51 – 60.

Schuller, Gunther. (1981). "Erich Leinsdorf Speaks Out," interview by Murray Ginsberg and Harry Sargous on Schuller's article, **O.C.S.M. Newsletter**, pp.23 – 31.

Schulman, Michael. (1978). "The Canadian Symphonic Hit And Miss Parade," **Performing Arts Magazine**, Spring, 1978, pp.31 – 33.

Schulman, Michael. (1979). "Boris Brott," (interview) **Canadian Composer**, No.142, June, 1979, pp.8 – 15.

Schuman, William. (1980). "The Purpose Of A Symphony Orchestra," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.31, August, 1980, pp.11 – 17.

Sennett, Richard. (1984). "Twilight of the Tenured Composer: The new music and its public," **Harper's Magazine**, Vol.269, December, 1984, pp.67 – 72.

Sigman, Matthew. (1985). "Conference 1985: Building New Audiences," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, August/September, 1986, pp.30 – 37.

Sigman, Matthew. (1987) "Growing Pains: The Saga of America's Regional Orchestras," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.38, June/July pp.18 – 22 ff.

Sigman, Matthew. (1984). "Orchestra Professionals Who Volunteer," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.35, October/November, 1984, p.15.

"Six symphonies in search of an audience and the ways they go about it," [Hamilton, Regina, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver. Edmonton] **Performing Arts Magazine**, Spring, 1977, pp.22 – 32.

Smith, John. (1985). "Paper For The Cultural Imperative'," mimeo, November, 1985, pp.4. [Discussion of the "rump group" election to the VSO Board in the "packed" annual meeting.]

Smith, Paul. (1977). "Accountability In The Arts," **Symphony News**, Vol.27, April, 1977, pp.10 – 11ff.

Stern, Isaac. (1976). "Music Is Not A Commodity," **Symphony News**, Vol.26, pp.14 – 15.

Survey Results. (1986). "Organization, Training Enhance Fundraising," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.37, June/July, 1986, pp.116 – 117.

Tarack, Gerald. (1984). "The Challenge of Orchestral Freelancing," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.35, December, p.12.

Training Spotlight. (1983). "Improving Education By Orchestras," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.34, August/September, 1983, p.55ff.

Ungerson, J. (1978) ."The World of the Orchestra," **The Strad Magazine**, Vol. 88, March, 1978, pp.1005ff.

Urwick, Currie and Partners, Ltd. (1973) "An Assessment of the Impact of Selected Large Performing Companies Upon The Canadian Economy," Canada Council, pp.44.

Van Vugt, H. (1987). "WSO awash in red ink," **The Saturday Windsor Star**, Section C1, December 19, 1987.

Vaughan, Denis. (1982). "Designing a Concert Hall: Does Reverberation Matter?" **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.33, pp.25 – 29.

Vlasselaer, Jean – Jacques. (1984) "Child of the nineteenth century entering the twenty – first: Canadian orchestras today," **Musicanada**, June, 1984, pp.34.

Waldeck, L. "The Future of the Symphony Orchestra," **International Musician**, Vol.84, No.7, January 1986, p.4 ff.

Waleson, Heidi. (1983). "London Orchestras At The Crossroads," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.36, June/July, 1985, pp.55 – 59.

Waleson, Heidi. (1987) "Why a Chamber Orchestra?" **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.38, April/May, 1987, pp.6 – 9ff.

Waleson, Heidi. (1985). "The Art and Economics of Entertainment," **Symphony Magazine**, Part I, Vol.36, December 1986, pp.35 – 38ff.

Waleson, Heidi. (1984). "Orchestras and the Local Business Connection," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.35, April/May, 1984, pp.11 – 15.

Waleson, Heidi. (1984). "The Professionalization of Orchestra Volunteers," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.35, October/November, 1984, pp.11 – 17.

Wall, G. and Mitchell, C. (1984). "The Community Impact of Canadian Orchestras," prepared for The Association of Canadian Orchestras and The Council for Business and the Arts in Canada, mimeo, pp.104 + questionnaire forms.

Wall, G. & Purdon, M. (1988). "The Economic Impact Of The Arts In Ontario," pp.96.

Warford, Pamela. (1984) "Focus Groups," **Symphony Magazine**, Vol.35, August/September, 1984, pp.42 – 43.

Webster, Betty. (1985). "Conference Report: The Future Of The Symphony Orchestra, Nov.20 – 22, 1985," Report on the first international conference on The Future of the Symphony Orchestra, Stockholm, mimeo, pp.5.

Webster, Betty. (1988). "Education – Outreach – Audience Development: Programmes & Activities of Canadian Orchestras," Paper presented to the Association of British Orchestras, Third Annual Conference, mimeo, pp.13.

Wegg, James. (1988) "Report (delegate: Music In Post – Modern America Symposium) To The Ontario Federation of Symphony Orchestras' Board of Directors," mimeo, pp.14 + appendix.

Whitton, Don. (1980). "Letter to the editor, Oct.16/80, on subject of audition procedures in Canada," O.C.S.M. Newsletter, Vol.4, No.2, November, 1980, pp.20 – 22.

Willett, John. (1985). "San Diego's New hall: A Unique Partnership," Symphony Magazine, Vol.36, December, 1985, pp.41 – 43ff.

Winters, Ken. (1975) "Canadian Orchestras In Growth," Canadian Music Book, Vol.10, Spring – Summer, 1975, pp. 87 – 89.

Winters, Ken. (1981). "Orchestras," in Encyclopedia of Music in Canada. pp.703 – 708.

Woodcock, Anthony. (1986). "Flair, Vitality And Enthusiasm," Classical Music, December 13, 1986, p.13

Zukerman, Eugenia. (1980). "Orchestra Power," Symphony Magazine, Vol.31, June, 1980, pp.23 – 26.